United Nations S/PV.4665

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4665th meeting

Friday, 13 December 2002, 3 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Katzarski
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Jiang Jiang
	France	Mr. Lenain
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mr. Pujalte
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Ms. Lee
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Negroponte

Agenda

The situation in Liberia

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-73945 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Liberia

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council.

"The international community and the United Nations Security Council have made joint and consistent efforts to promote peace and security in Western Africa, particularly in the Mano River Union region. Such efforts have represented a major investment of resources and capabilities. The peace process in Sierra Leone is the tangible result of those efforts. The Council will maintain its efforts and continue to promote understanding and peace in the region in order to guarantee that the peace process in Sierra Leone, which remains fragile, takes root and benefits the people of Sierra Leone and the entire Mano River region.

"On the other hand, the Security Council is deeply concerned about the situation in Liberia and the threat it constitutes to international peace and security in the region as a result of the activities of the Government of Liberia and the continuing internal conflict in that country, including the armed attacks by the 'Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy' (LURD). The internal conflict and significant violence in Liberia are producing widespread refugee flows and displacement of people in Liberia, exacerbating the humanitarian situation and fuelling the movement of irregular combatants and the flow of weapons throughout the region. The Council condemns the failure of the Government to comply with the Council's demands in resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001, and the failure of the Government, other States, and others, including the LURD, to respect the measures imposed in that resolution, including the continuing import of weapons in breach of the arms embargo. All of these developments threaten the peace process in Sierra Leone, the stability of the entire West African region, and, most tragically, are causing great humanitarian suffering for the Liberian people themselves.

"To address the situation in Liberia and the threat it poses to international peace and security in the region, the Security Council and the international community should cooperate on a comprehensive strategy that mobilizes international efforts to reach a ceasefire, resolve the internal conflict and establish an inclusive peace process; promotes peace and national reconciliation in Liberia and the development of a stable and democratic political process; addresses humanitarian issues; combats the illicit flow of weapons into the country; and guarantees human rights. The Council is committed to support the efforts of regional and other international actors to carry out such a strategy.

"Such a strategy must be based on two fundamental principles. First, it must have the input of key regional actors and be part of a comprehensive approach to building an integrated system of regional peace and security. Secondly, peace and security in the Mano River Union region requires the President of Liberia to engage constructively with the international community in working to achieve national reconciliation and political reform in Liberia.

"With these principles in mind, the Security Council's work on a coordinated strategy with the international community will promote the following objectives. In terms of the regional perspective, the Security Council will maintain its support for the Rabat Process, under the sponsorship of the King of Morocco, and strongly encourage Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia to follow up on their commitments to undertake confidence-building measures and the establishment of security measures along their shared borders. In this connection, the Council considers that the initiative taken by the Presidents of the three countries to hold a direct dialogue in order to give impetus to the Rabat Process is a most desirable development. The Council urges the President of Liberia to actively participate in those meetings.

"The Security Council expresses its strong support for the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) moratorium on small arms and light weapons in the region. The Council encourages the ECOWAS countries to implement these commitments fully and to strengthen the implementation mechanisms in order to stop the illegal trade of arms, in particular the flow of small arms and light weapons into Liberia.

"The Security Council commends the efforts made by ECOWAS, and those of the newly established International Contact Group on Liberia, to promote peace and stability in Liberia and in the Mano River region. The Council considers that the active involvement of these mechanisms is critical for national reconciliation and political reform.

"In this regard, the Security Council encourages the African Union and ECOWAS member States actively to promote the full implementation of existing security arrangements as well as further initiatives designed to support such arrangements among the countries of the Mano River Union.

"The Security Council reiterates its demands to the Government of Liberia to comply with resolutions 1343 (2001) and 1408 (2002) and to all parties to respect the measures which those resolutions imposed and extended. The demands referred to in those resolutions must be met for these measures to be terminated in accordance with those resolutions. The Council takes note of the positions of the African Union and ECOWAS on the sanctions regime in Liberia. The Council will keep sanctions under review to ensure they are consistent with this statement and resolutions 1343 (2001) and 1408 (2002) and will continue to monitor whether sanctions are having any humanitarian impact on the population of Liberia.

"The Security Council urges all States in the region to honour their commitments to prevent armed individuals from using their national territory to prepare and launch attacks on neighbouring countries. The Council again reminds all States of their obligations to comply with the embargo on the sale or supply of arms and related materiel to Liberia imposed by resolution 1343 (2001). The Council underlines that the embargo applies to all sales or supplies to any recipient in Liberia, including all non-State actors such as the LURD.

"In terms of a constructive engagement in Liberia, in particular by the President of Liberia on achieving the objectives of ending the violence and promoting national reconciliation, the Security Council is committed to promote: an expanded role for the United Nations Peace-building Support Office in Liberia (UNOL), along with the more active participation of the recently created United Nations Office for West Africa. In this regard, the Council welcomes the appointment of the new Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Liberia and urges the Government of Liberia to cooperate fully with the activities of UNOL. The Council would like UNOL to carry out, inter alia, the following tasks:

"Offering assistance to the Liberian authorities and to the public for strengthening democratic institutions and the rule of law, including the promotion of an independent press and an enabling environment for political parties to operate freely in Liberia;

"Contributing to and monitoring the preparation of free and fair elections in 2003, especially through the promotion of an independent electoral commission;

"Enhancing and monitoring respect for human rights in Liberia, including through constructive dialogue with the Government of Liberia, with particular attention to reaching out to local civil society groups and to encouraging the establishment of an independent and functional human rights commission;

"Promoting national reconciliation and resolution of the conflict, including through support forinitiatives on the ground;

"Supporting the Government of Liberia in the implementation of peace agreements to be adopted;

"Engaging in an educational campaign to present accurately United Nations policies and activities regarding Liberia.

"The Security Council has written to the Secretary-General recommending such a strengthening of the mandate of UNOL and requesting reports every three months.

"The Security Council considers that an urgent effort is required to improve the serious humanitarian situation in Liberia, especially to address the needs of internally displaced persons and refugees. In that regard, the Council urges the Government of Liberia and the combatants, particularly the rebel group LURD, to provide unrestricted access to United Nations humanitarian agencies and non-governmental organizations to areas where refugees need to be assisted and human rights protected. Likewise, the Council encourages neighbouring countries of Liberia to continue to give access to international humanitarian organizations and non-governmental humanitarian groups to border areas where refugees and displaced people are. It calls on all States in the region to respect fully international law on the treatment of refugees and displaced persons.

"The Security Council urges all humanitarian organizations and donor countries to continue to provide humanitarian relief to the refugees and internally displaced persons.

"The Security Council is committed to support efforts to promote national reconciliation, the restoration of peace and the creation of new conditions for internal political stability. For that purpose, the Council urges the Government of Liberia and the LURD to conclude a ceasefire agreement and a comprehensive peace process, including provision for disarmament and demobilization of combatants and comprehensive security sector reform. In this regard, the Council calls upon all States to refrain from providing any military support to all parties in Liberia and from any act that might aggravate the situation on the borders between Liberia and its neighbours.

"The Security Council calls on the Government of Liberia to work to create a favourable environment so that a genuine national reconciliation conference can succeed, with the broad participation of all groups in Liberian society, based inside the country and abroad.

"The Security Council also calls on the Government of Liberia to implement the necessary measures and political reforms which are a prerequisite for universal, free, fair, transparent and all-inclusive elections in 2003. The Council stresses the importance of a broad and overall participation in this process by all political parties and the return of all political leaders to the country.

"The Security Council calls upon the international community to consider how it can support through financial and technical assistance any disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme that may be established as part of the cessation of hostilities and commitment to political reform in Liberia. Special attention and resources should be given to assist women and children in the process of their reintegration and to provide opportunities for young ex-combatants and child soldiers to be fully reintegrated into society.

"The Security Council recognizes that the success of a comprehensive international strategy for Liberia rests on the direct and active involvement of the African Union, ECOWAS, and the International Contact Group, working with the United Nations Offices in the region in accordance with their mandates.

"The Security Council calls on the Government of Liberia to cooperate with all these efforts as a means to find a peaceful solution of the conflict, reform its political processes and fulfil its humanitarian, social and economic responsibilities to the Liberian people. Liberia's cooperation is also essential to restore fully relations with its neighbours and to normalize its relations with the international community.

"As the Government of Liberia makes progress working with the international community in achieving the objectives set out in this statement, the Council calls on the international community to consider how it might help future economic development in Liberia aimed at improving the welfare of the people of Liberia.

"The Security Council will remain engaged with the Liberian Government and its people, given the Council's conviction that peace in that

country will put an end to the suffering of the Liberian people and find a basis for lasting peace in the region.

"The Security Council requests the Secretary-General to monitor the situation in Liberia and to keep the Council informed of developments to fulfil the objectives described herein. The Council is considering sending a mission to the region, including to Liberia, to assess the situation during the first half of 2003."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2002/36.

The Security Council has thus completed the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.35 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4666

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4666th meeting

Friday, 13 December 2002, 3.35 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Katzarski
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Jiang Jiang
	France	Mr. Duclos
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mr. Pujalte
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Singapore	Ms. Lee
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Negroponte

Agenda

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994

Establishment of the list of candidates for Judges on the International Tribunal for Rwanda

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-73951 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States, between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994

Establishment of the list of candidates for Judges on the International Tribunal for Rwanda

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Rwanda in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisions rules of procedure.

There being no objection it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Muvunyi (Rwanda) took a seat at the Council table.

The President *(spoke in Spanish)*: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2002/1356, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection it is so decided.

I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/2002/1356.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

In favour:

Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There were fifteen votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1449 (2002).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 3.40 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4667

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4667th meeting

Friday, 13 December 2002, 3.40 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Katzarski
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Jiang Jiang
	France	Mr. Duclos
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mr. Pujalte
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Singapore	Ms. Lee
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Negroponte

Agenda

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-73957 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations. Members of the Council have before them document S/2002/1351, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the United States of America.

I shall first give the floor to those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Wehbe (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): The Syrian Arab Republic will vote against the draft resolution before us because the sponsor of the draft resolution insists on using language that deviates from the main purpose of the draft resolution, which is to condemn the act of international terrorism carried out in Kikambala, Kenya, which led to the death of a number of innocent civilians. We would like to state that Syria was among the first to support the two earlier Security Council resolutions, resolutions 1438 (2002) and 1440 (2002), which condemned the tragic events in Bali and in Moscow respectively.

It was our hope that a draft resolution on the events that occurred in Kenya would be unanimously adopted by the Council, and that it would be on the pattern of the two aforementioned resolutions, rather than having its scope expanded to include elements that imply direct intervention in the internal affairs of the country where the events took place. are concerned also about the unacceptable political references that reflect negatively on the situation in the Middle East region, including the situation in the occupied Arab territories. Such references do not accord with our understanding of, or position on, the situation. Nor does the attempt to link Israel to efforts to combat terrorism; this exploits the international campaign against terrorism.

During the consultations on this draft resolution, Syria expressed its wish that its sponsors would take into consideration our view that the draft resolution be amended along the lines of the resolutions adopted on Bali and on Moscow. Regrettably, our efforts and those of many other Council members to that effect did not yield the desired results.

In order to further clarify our position, we wish to emphasize the following. First, Syria unreservedly condemns the terrorist attack perpetrated in Kikambala, Kenya, which led to the deaths of a number of innocent civilians and reaffirms its sincere solidarity with the Government and the people of Kenya in the face of such terrorist attacks. Secondly, Syria reiterates its condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations and reaffirms its commitment to Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) and its commitment to combating international terrorism.

Finally, Syria will vote against the draft resolution before us because it cannot accept its repeated mention of Israel in a manner that is not in keeping with the wording of the resolutions on Bali and on Moscow. The draft resolution repeats the name of Israel at a time when Israel is practising the worst forms of terrorism and daily committing crimes against humanity in the occupied Arab territories, the latest of which killed 10 innocent Palestinian civilians in the Boreij refugee camp on 6 December and five innocent civilians in Gaza this morning — on the very day when we are about to vote on this draft resolution — not to mention the fact that Israel has killed three United Nations international civil servants during the past two weeks alone.

Those considerations oblige us to vote against the draft resolution.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The result of the voting is as follows: 14 votes in favour, one vote against and no abstentions. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 1450 (2002).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.50 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4668

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4668th meeting

Monday, 16 December 2002, 3 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Wang Yingfan
	France	Mr. De la Sablière
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mr. Pujalte
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74078 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East, including the Palestinian question

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, and in the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen, Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Roed-Larsen to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen, Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General. I give him the floor.

Mr. Roed-Larsen: Since the Secretariat's last briefing to the Security Council on 12 November, the security and political environments have seen developments which, in the near future, could further complicate an already fragile situation on the ground. However, there have been some positive developments related to the diplomatic front.

Sadly, first, three United Nations staff members lost their lives in recent weeks as the result of actions of the Israel Defence Forces (IDF): Iain Hook in Jenin on 23 November and Osama Tahrawi and Ahlam Kandil in Gaza on 6 December. All three were employed by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). A preliminary United Nations investigation into Mr. Hook's death indicates that he was killed at a time when there was no threat to IDF forces in the vicinity of the UNRWA compound in Jenin. It also determined that there had been no fire aimed at IDF forces at any time originating within the UNRWA compound. Needless to say, it is in the interest of all that the facts surrounding the event be resolved, if only to ensure that incidents such as these are not repeated.

The killing of Iain Hook, along with the recent destruction by the IDF of a World Food Programme storehouse in Gaza containing food supplies for tens of thousands of persons, reflect a troubling indifference to the sanctity of United Nations facilities.

The killings of United Nations staff members also highlight a larger issue: the need for the IDF to ensure that its soldiers act in a manner that does not place civilians in harm's way. The Secretary-General has repeatedly urged Israel to refrain from the excessive and disproportionate use of deadly force in civilian areas. The Government of Israel must conduct itself in keeping with its obligation as an occupying Power to protect the civilian population. Once again, the United Nations urges it to ensure that the IDF behaves with greater restraint and discipline and in conformity with international humanitarian law.

Unfortunately, terrorist attacks on Israeli civilians have also continued since the last briefing to the Security Council. Two of the attacks, carried out outside Israel, have added a new and worrying element to the tragic cycle of violence. The day of the Likud Party primary election was marred by the death of nine Israelis in two separate terrorist incidents. In the first, an Israeli-owned hotel in Mombasa, Kenya, was bombed and three Israelis were killed. Later that day, an attack on the Likud polling station in the northern Israeli town of Beit Shean resulted in the deaths of six Israelis and the wounding of more than 20, some dozen of them seriously. Much greater loss of life in Kenya was narrowly averted when missiles that had been fired at an Israeli tourist charter plane carrying 271 passengers and crew missed their target.

The toll of casualties in the conflict has tragically reached new peaks since the most recent briefing to the Council. At least 88 Palestinians and 37 Israelis have been killed in the past five weeks. We have called on Israel to act with restraint and in keeping with international humanitarian law in its operations in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. We have repeatedly demanded — in the strongest of terms — that the Palestinian Authority take all measures within its power to apprehend and prosecute those who carry out terrorist attacks and those who order such attacks. We

have asked the Palestinian Authority to do everything in its power to prevent the commission of further acts of terrorism. I made that point to President Arafat again on Friday, when I last met with him at his Ramallah headquarters, and emphasized the need for immediate and bold steps. We have also repeatedly called on all Palestinian groups to bring an end to such wicked acts.

The humanitarian crisis continues to deepen. Cities in the West Bank and Gaza Strip suffer from frequent round-the-clock curfews, and internal and external closures in the occupied Palestinian territories have all but shut down the Palestinian economy. We recognize Israel's right to take reasonable measures to defend its people, and it would be wrong to underestimate the security challenges that confront Israel. However, the IDF's security measures are creating a humanitarian catastrophe in the Palestinian areas. Let us also be clear that lasting security for Israel will be found only through a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

Meanwhile, the humanitarian crisis cannot, and should not, be solved through donor support alone. Over the past two years, the Palestinians have received more than $1 billion a year in donor assistance. The World Bank estimates that, even if assistance were doubled to $2 billion a year, it would have only have a marginal effect on rising poverty levels. The Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator in the Occupied Territories estimates that some 60 per cent of the Palestinian population of the West Bank and Gaza Strip is now living below the poverty line. Only a political solution can provide the underpinnings necessary for reviving the Palestinian economy and for improving living conditions.

On 12 November, the United Nations convened an inter-agency meeting to review the humanitarian action plan prepared by an assessment mission led by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. The Quartet, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and other donors, and the Palestinian Authority also participated in the meeting. As decided at the 17 September Quartet meeting, held here in New York, the Quartet envoys will present recommendations to the principals meeting in Washington later this week on the reorganization of existing international coordination structures to render them more efficient and more responsive to the evolving humanitarian challenge.

The Government of Israel recently took a significant step forward, easing the crisis by transferring approximately $28 million in withheld tax revenues to the Authority, and undertook to begin a regular system of revenue transfers. Such a system of regular transfers should now commence. The approximately $580 million that is owed in arrears should be transferred as well. Regular transfers go a long way towards lessening the humanitarian crisis and also towards facilitating Palestinian Authority reform. Without such transfers and a lifting of internal movement restrictions, even a drastic increase in donor assistance would only scratch the surface of the growing need.

According to the IMF, if the Government of Israel fulfils its promise of fund transfers, the Palestinian Authority will have ample funds — which will amount to roughly $95 million per month — to meet its budgetary needs for the coming year and will even have a surplus with which to begin paying off the more than $500 million in debt that it has accumulated. For most of the past year, the Palestinian Authority has been able to pay the salaries of its more than 100,000 employees only through generous contributions of budgetary support from donor countries. That assistance has prevented poverty levels from rising further. Israeli transfers of value added tax owed to the Palestinian Authority would allow the international community once again to focus its assistance on development and State-building.

We have observed little improvement with regard to the commitments made by the Government of Israel concerning the humanitarian situation. Those include shorter waiting times for ambulances, assistance for Palestinians seeking urgent medical attention at checkpoints, facilitated passage of water tankers and free movement of international organizations.

The United Nations is troubled by reports that the Israeli military is confiscating and demolishing homes in Hebron in order to build a new road for the use of Jewish settlers. The construction and expansion of settlements in occupied territory is clearly prohibited by international humanitarian law. In the period from the signing of the Oslo Accords to 2001, the settler population in the West Bank — excluding East Jerusalem — and the Gaza Strip expanded 95 per cent, from 109,784 to 213,672. Each new settlement makes peace more remote and potentially prejudices a permanent territorial agreement. Also troubling is the

erection of a new security wall east of the Green Line, which threatens to sever thousands of Palestinians from their agricultural lands and from other sources of livelihood.

On 14 to 15 November, the Quartet Task Force on Palestinian Reform met at the capital level in Jordan, hosted by the European Union. The Task Force reviewed progress in implementing reforms in the areas of financial accountability, market economics, civil service, judiciary/rule of law, local Government and elections, as well as civil society engagement in the reform process. The Task Force also heard reports regarding the increasingly severe Palestinian humanitarian crisis and fiscal crisis, finding that both are stymying institutional development efforts. On 9 December, the Task Force met at local level in Jerusalem to assess progress on all of those fronts, focusing on civil service, the judiciary/rule of law and election reforms.

The Task Force determined that the Palestinian Authority has made considerable, but uneven, progress in advancing the reform agenda. Financial reforms have been particularly substantial, while progress in the judicial sector has been extremely slow. Security reform, which is not within the purview of the Task Force, has also stalled. President Arafat has appointed an elections commission that is universally regarded as independent, and the Palestinian Legislative Council's legal committee has begun working to revise the Palestinian elections law. Rapid implementation of the road map will do much to facilitate all of these reforms, including creating a climate within which free, fair and open elections can soon take place.

The Task Force called upon the Palestinian Authority to continue advancing reform efforts. It also called on the Government of Israel to end actions impeding reform, including withholding tax revenues owed to the Palestinian Authority and restricting the movement of Palestinian officials involved in the reform process.

Since the last briefing, the upcoming electoral contest in Israel has begun to take shape. Each of the two largest political parties, Labor and Likud, have chosen their leaders and candidates for Prime Minister. On 23 November, the Labor Party elected Haifa Mayor, Amran Mitzna to lead them into the general elections scheduled for 28 January 2003. Leading up to the poll, Mr. Mitzna consistently emphasized that once elected he would re-open negotiations with Mr. Arafat, evacuate settlements in the Gaza Strip and seek to close a deal with the Palestinians within a year. If that were not possible, then he would work for unilateral separation.

On 28 November, Prime Minister Ariel Sharon once again won the leadership of the Likud Party. In a further development, on 4 December, Prime Minister Sharon delivered a major policy speech on Israel-Palestinian relations. In the speech, he said that he endorsed President Bush's 24 June vision statement, which supports the establishment of a Palestinian State. Prime Minister Sharon described that statement as a "reasonable, pragmatic and practicable one, which offers a real opportunity to achieve an agreement". He also stated that political concessions that Israel has already made since Oslo are irreversible.

The consensus around the two-State solution is growing. It is backed by opinion polls that show that the large majorities of both the Israeli and the Palestinian communities support the concept, and the leaders of the two major Israeli parties have expressed their support. As members well know, there is nearly unanimous support within the international community, including in the Middle East, for that vision. The Quartet has taken the lead in advocating that outcome.

This paradox — the steadily growing gap between the deteriorating situation on the ground and the growing consensus about where to go — has to be resolved. The Quartet road map, which has evolved, since last time I briefed the Council, through the hard work of the Quartet's envoys, is the best tool to show us how to get there. It is, therefore, imperative that the upcoming Quartet meeting, to be held in Washington, D.C., this week, finalizes a plan for moving forward and that it sets out, in parallel and with reciprocity, political, security and economic steps to be monitored under the auspices of the Quartet. Only this can restart a process that stops the meaningless and unfathomable fear and suffering of both peoples. We know where to go; we should now start. The parties and the international community must work in tandem towards our common goal: the establishment of a State of Palestine living in peace alongside Israel within secure and recognized borders. Only this can provide harmony, justice and prosperity for both peoples, and the beginning of a comprehensive and lasting peace based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 1397 (2002).

I now turn to recent developments in Lebanon. While the general situation along the Blue Line since the last briefing, on 12 November, continued to be one of uneasy stability, there were two elements that raised tension over the past month. On 8 December, a roadside bomb placed on the Lebanese side of the Blue Line was detonated. The explosion was directed at a passing IDF patrol on the Israeli side of the Blue Line and injured two IDF soldiers, one seriously. This is the first serious violation of the Blue Line from the Lebanese side since 29 August, when Hizbullah targeted IDF positions in the Sheb'a farms area. While the full circumstances and responsibility regarding this incident are unclear as yet, it is evident that tension has increased and that the 8 December bombing was a serious and totally unacceptable Blue Line violation, which tragically and severely wounded two Israeli soldiers.

Since the last briefing to the Council, on 12 November, Israeli military aircraft have continued to violate the Blue Line and Lebanese airspace on a regular basis. These air violations continue to draw anti-aircraft fire from the Lebanese side of the Blue Line. On 20 November, two days prior to Lebanese Independence Day celebrations, there was a sudden and significant increase in the number of overflights. Six air violations, involving 15 Israeli jets, were recorded. The continuation of Israeli overflights and the anti-aircraft fire that they elicit threaten to further destabilize the already tense situation along the Blue Line. These violations contribute to a continuing level of tension along the Blue Line. They threaten to destabilize further what is already a fragile situation. All concerned parties, therefore, are reminded of their obligation to fully respect the Blue Line and to refrain from further violations thereof.

I paid a visit to Beirut a few days ago and met with the President, the Prime Minister and other senior officials. One of the main reasons for this mission was to discuss with the Lebanese leadership how to ensure a reasonable and diplomatic approach to dealing with the potentially escalatory water issue between Lebanon and Israel. Since the last briefing to the Council, there has been no change in the political situation with regard to the Wazzani springs issue; there is no meaningful communication between the parties. We are concerned that unless a mechanism is established soon to handle future developments through diplomatic channels, we may see, sooner or later, a dangerous escalation of tensions between Israel and Lebanon, with possible regional consequences.

I am pleased to report that the Lebanese leadership assured me that they would remain within the parameters of the report on the water issue that they submitted in October, and that they would also refrain from any unilateral moves regarding water. They reiterated their desire to have some sort of mechanism using the good offices of the United Nations, in order to establish a diplomatic means for resolving future water disputes. They agreed to keep their water activities within the parameters defined in their report and to abstain from any unilateral action for the time being, and they committed themselves to notify the United Nations before going ahead with any such action in the future. They also seek to reach an agreement on water quantities, via the United Nations as a third party, working with other key members of the international community. They are willing to install a measurement instrument — a water meter — after reaching such an agreement

The Lebanese assurances are of course in anticipation of this mechanism becoming operational. I consider this a positive development. The success of any such arrangement is, however, contingent on a clear acceptance by both concerned parties. I will, and I believe we need to, encourage this non-violent diplomatic option in order to defuse the situation.

We should not neglect the dangers facing the Middle East or the perils of inaction during this critical period. The peace process has been at a stalemate for more than two years, and the entire region has suffered tremendously as a result. The Quartet road map sets out a coherent framework for shifting the parties from violence and confrontation to negotiations and compromise. A consensus at the upcoming Quartet meeting must be our highest priority. This is not the time to hesitate.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Roed-Larsen for his comprehensive briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I would now like to invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussion of this item.

The meeting was adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4669

Security Council

Distr.: General
17 December 2002

Original: English

Official communiqué of the 4669th (closed) meeting of the Security Council

Held in private at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 17 December 2002, at 10.30 a.m.

In accordance with rule 55 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the following communiqué was issued through the Secretary-General in place of a verbatim record:

"On 17 December 2002, the Security Council, pursuant to annex II, sections A and B of resolution 1353 (2001), held its 4669th meeting in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF).

"The Security Council and the troop-contributing countries heard a briefing under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure by Mr. Hédi Annabi, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations.

"The members of the Council had a constructive exchange of views with representatives of participating troop-contributing countries."

02-74527 (E) 171202

United Nations S/PV.4670

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4670th meeting

Tuesday, 17 December 2002, 12.10 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Wang Donghua
	France	Mr. Duclos
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Corr
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mrs. Arce de Jeannet
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Singapore	Ms. Lee
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Mekdad
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Rosenblatt

Agenda

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/2002/1328).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74395 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 12.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/2002/1328)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2002/1328, containing the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force. Members of the Council also have before them document S/2002/1368, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, France, Guinea, Ireland, Mauritius, Mexico, Norway, Russian Federation, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1451 (2002).

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

> "As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/2002/1328) states in paragraph 11: '... the situation in the Middle East is very tense and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.' That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2002/37.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4671

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4671st meeting

Tuesday, 17 December 2002, 3.30 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Wang Yingfan
	France	Mr. Duclos
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mr. Pujalte
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Ms. Lee
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Rosenblatt

Agenda

The situation in Angola

Interim report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Angola (S/2002/1353).

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74630 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Angola

Interim report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Angola (S/2002/1353)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Angola in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola), took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, and in the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola and head of the United Nations Mission in Angola.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I invite Mr. Gambari to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the interim report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Angola (S/2002/1353).

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola and head of the United Nations Mission in Angola.

I call on Mr. Gambari.

Mr. Gambari: I have the honour to present, on behalf of the Secretary-General, the interim report on Angola. As the Council will recall, by its resolution 1433 (2002) of 15 August 2002, the Council requested the Secretary-General to provide an interim review of the United Nations Mission in Angola (UNMA), which was established as a follow-on mission to the United Nations Office in Angola (UNOA) to perform the tasks recommended in the Secretary-General's report of 26 July 2002 (S/2002/834), as reflected in paragraph 3 of resolution 1433 (2002).

The report, which the Council now has before it, summarizes the key developments in Angola since August. It highlights UNMA's activities in the political, military, human rights, child protection, humanitarian and development fields, and identifies the areas where additional efforts are required in order to consolidate peace in Angola.

I am pleased to report that, in the four months since the beginning of this Mission, UNMA has successfully initiated activities in nearly all the areas mandated to it, including the conclusion of the work of the Joint Commission, participation as an observer in the Military Commission and new activities to promote human rights in Angola.

The Government of Angola has also confirmed to me the importance it attaches to human rights issues, especially in the area of capacity-building. With the concurrence of the Government, UNMA's human rights division is expanding its field presence in the provinces.

The Mission's disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) component is also in place. Its leader has chaired the sub-group on demobilization and reintegration, which was established by, and provided recommendations to, the Joint Commission on the social reintegration of ex-combatants. We envisage a continuing role for the technical sub-group in close consultation with the Government, even after the formal dissolution of the Joint Commission itself.

UNMA is also coordinating, through the relevant United Nations agencies, aspects of humanitarian assistance, including resource mobilization and the provision of essential life-saving assistance such as foods and medicines.

After my arrival in Luanda on 14 September to assume my new functions as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Angola, head of UNMA and Chairman of the Joint Commission, the following four priorities were established.

The first was to re-establish the Joint Commission, in accordance with the Memorandum of Commitment signed by the parties on 26 August in the presence of the Secretary-General, and to bring its work to a reasonable conclusion, without being restricted by unrealistic timelines or encouraging unnecessary delays in its work.

The second priority was the establishment of the United Nations Mission in Angola as an integrated and coordinated mission with a two-cluster structure: a political-military-DDR-human rights cluster, which is directly supervised by myself, and a humanitarian-development cluster, which I supervise indirectly through the Resident Humanitarian Coordinator.

The third priority was to raise domestic and international awareness of the serious humanitarian situation in Angola, particularly the plight of more than 4 million internally displaced people, as well as returning refugees, ex-combatants and their dependants. In addition, maximum efforts were made to facilitate the work of the United Nations humanitarian agencies on the ground and to help mobilize both resources from within — that is, the Government of Angola's own resources — and those of the international community in order to meet the enormous humanitarian challenges still facing the country.

The final priority was to assist the Government of Angola in organizing an international donor conference to mobilize resources for the medium-term and long-term reconstruction of the country.

I should like to touch briefly on the status of implementation of those four priorities.

With regard to the Joint Commission, it was re-established under the chairmanship of the United Nations and was composed of the Government of Angola and UNITA representatives, as well as the "Troika" observers in order to facilitate and verify the implementation of the remaining tasks under the Lusaka Protocol, as particularly specified in the Memorandum of Commitment of 26 August. Its substantive work commenced on 26 September 2002 and was concluded on 20 November 2002, eight years to the day after the Lusaka Protocol had been signed.

The Government and UNITA raised many issues and concerns relating to the consolidation of peace, which were discussed within the framework of the Joint Commission in a very frank — often too frank — but always transparent manner. Agreement was reached on most of the issues, while others, such as the holding of the second round of presidential elections, were considered by both sides to have been overtaken by events. There were also some issues on which no consensus was reached within the framework of the Joint Commission. For example, it should be noted that neither the Memorandum of Commitment of 26 August nor, prior to that, the Memorandum of Understanding of 4 April addressed some of the remaining tasks under the Lusaka Protocol. Those included: provision by the Government and UNITA of information on the location of landmines and other explosives; verification of the neutrality of the national police and the disarming of all civilians; provision of guarantees of basic freedoms and human rights within the national reconciliation process; and the implementation of decentralization and administrative deconcentration programmes.

As Chairman of the Joint Commission, I drew attention to those omissions during the work of the Commission. In response, the Government delegation referred to the efforts being made by the Angolan authorities to address those issues, while UNITA made important suggestions in that regard. However, I am pleased to report that both the Government and UNITA agreed to address the medium-term and long-term tasks through a bilateral mechanism that they decided to establish in accordance with the final declaration of the Joint Commission, which was adopted on 20 November. I am also delighted to report that since then, the ruling politburo of the Movimento Popular da Libertação de Angola (MPLA) and the UNITA Political Commission met, for the first time in the country's history, from 2 to 5 December to discuss common issues, including the revision of the Constitution as a prelude to the holding of national elections.

I should also like to refer to the Joint Commission's final declaration, which was proposed by the Government, recommending that the Security Council consider the immediate lifting of all sanctions imposed on UNITA. In that connection, I am pleased to report that the decision made by the Council in resolution 1448 (2002) of 9 December to lift all

sanctions imposed on UNITA since 1993 has been welcomed by both UNITA and the Government, which have described it as another step on the road towards national reconciliation in Angola.

Concerning the establishment of UNMA as an integrated and coordinated mission, following my arrival in Luanda, UNMA initiated a number of initiatives at the policy level, including information-sharing and regular meetings to exchange views and coordinate activities between the two clusters of UNMA. Those initiatives have provided an integrated strategy for United Nations activities in Angola, thereby promoting timely feedback from the political level to the policy and programme implementation levels. I have provided support for the activities of the United Nations country team, and, on a number of occasions, I intervened directly with the Angolan authorities at the highest levels on behalf of a number of agencies in situations in which they had encountered specific problems or difficulties in their operations.

The Humanitarian/Resident Coordinator in Angola was also appointed a member of the United Nations delegation to the Joint Commission, and he has made valuable contributions to its work, especially when it comes to discussions of the humanitarian situation in the country. As members are aware, following my return to Headquarters, the Deputy Special Representative was designated officer-in-charge of UNMA in order to ensure the continued coordination and integration of UNMA's work and to underscore the principal remaining challenges in Angola, which are humanitarian and developmental.

I now turn to the humanitarian situation. The overall humanitarian situation in Angola remains extremely difficult, although there has been some notable progress in meeting the needs of the Angolan people. Since June 2002, the humanitarian operation has doubled in size and more than 1 million people have been assisted as a result of the delivery of food, health care, water and sanitation items. Nevertheless, there is still a need to redouble those efforts as the process of resettlement of 80,000 ex-combatants and 200,000 family members, millions of internally displaced persons and hundreds of thousands of returning refugees from neighbouring countries gets under way.

At this stage, the humanitarian community remains focused on meeting acute emergency needs, while hoping to move towards recovery and reconstruction in the coming months. It needs to be assisted financially and materially and with logistical support. On 26 November, I participated in the official launch of the consolidated inter-agency appeal for 2003, which we hope will be the last emergency appeal for Angola. The appeal requires some $384 million to enable the agencies to fund and complement the efforts of the Government of Angola in many ways, particularly through the provision of vital assistance to the affected population in need.

With regard to the international donor conference, it will be recalled that the Government of Angola had requested the United Nations, and the Security Council has agreed to authorize UNMA to assist and support its efforts to convene such a conference in order to secure additional financing for humanitarian assistance and post-conflict development. In that regard, consultations and coordination efforts have been ongoing between the Government of Angola and the United Nations. As a result, it has been agreed that the conference should not be rushed, but rather that it should be properly prepared for and that the prerequisites for a successful outcome should be met, because there is no point in having an international donor conference in which the donors do not donate. Therefore, that would include an effort on the part of the Government in order to allay any concerns that the donor community might have with regard to the allocation and spending of national revenues. Meanwhile, the tentative date for the donor conference would be during the first quarter of 2003, and the venue would be in Brussels.

In conclusion, while it is fair to say that enormous progress has been made in the peace process, there is still much that remains to be done by the people of Angola and by the international community to further consolidate peace and to enhance national reconciliation, national reconstruction and national development. Next month, Angola will take its place at this table as a member of the Council. At that time, the country will move from being a recurring item on the Council's agenda to becoming a valuable contributor to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Meanwhile, however, we should continue to support the efforts of the Angolan Government aimed at the comprehensive implementation of demobilization, social reinsertion and resettlement programmes for ex-combatants, internally displaced persons and refugees. We should also respond

positively to the Government's request by providing technical assistance for the forthcoming national elections, tentatively envisaged for 2004. Our efforts must also be intensified to help address the humanitarian situation, to help build capacity in human rights, with particular emphasis on children's rights, and to provide assistance in mine action.

Finally, I wish to recall that the United Nations has been involved in the promotion of a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Angola since 1988, when the first United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM I) verified the withdrawal of Cuban and South African forces. That initial United Nations presence has been followed subsequently by that of UNAVEM II, UNAVEM III, the United Nations Observer Mission in Angola, the United Nations Office in Angola, and currently UNMA. At all times, the United Nations has been, and I hope will remain, a steadfast partner in the efforts of the Government and the people of Angola at peacemaking and national reconciliation. In that regard, we must not forget Alioune Blondin Beye and many others who have lost their lives while serving the United Nations in Angola. Indeed, it seems to me that the greatest tribute to their memory should be the irreversibility of peace in Angola and a new resolve that never again will the soil of Angola receive for burial the bodies of its sons killed in a civil war.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Gambari for his introduction of the report of the Secretary-General.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultation, the Council will proceed to informal consultations on this item following the adjournment of the 4672nd meeting.

The meeting rose at 4:05 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4672

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4672nd meeting

Tuesday, 17 December 2002, 4.05 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Wang Yingfan
	France	Mr. Duclos
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mr. Pujalte
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Ms. Lee
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Rosenblatt

Agenda

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74636 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now continue its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council.

"The Security Council recalls the statement of its President of 8 October 2002 (S/PRST/2002/26) concerning the Work Programme (S/2002/1075) of the Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) of 28 September 2001 (the Counter-Terrorism Committee).

"The Security Council notes the key role to be played by international, regional and subregional organizations in supporting Government capacity-strengthening on counter-terrorism and in furthering the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). It encourages the Counter-Terrorism Committee to build a dialogue with and encourage a dialogue between such organizations active in the areas covered by that resolution.

"In this context, the Security Council requests the Counter-Terrorism Committee, with a view to improving the flow of information on experiences, standards and best practice, and to coordinating ongoing activity, to invite all relevant international, regional and subregional organizations to:

"(a) Contribute to a report information on their activities in the area of counter-terrorism;

"(b) Send a representative to attend a Special Meeting of the Counter-Terrorism Committee with international, regional and subregional organizations on 7 March 2003.

"The Security Council invites the Counter-Terrorism Committee to report on developments at regular intervals."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2002/38.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4673

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4673rd meeting

Wednesday, 18 December 2002, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Wang Yingfan
	France	Mr. Tosi
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Mauritius	Mr. Koonjul
	Mexico	Mrs. Arce de Jeannet
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Wehbe
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

Briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74654 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Briefings by the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola, the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia, the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, we will hear briefings by the Chairmen of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990), concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait; the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola; the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999); the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia; the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa; and the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.

In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, and in the absence of objection, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend invitations under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Ole Peter Kolby, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait; Mr. Richard Ryan, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola; the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999); Mr. Kishore Mahbubani, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia; Mr. Jagdish Koonjul, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa; and Mr. Wegger Christian Strommen, Chairman of the Working Group of the Security Council on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations.

It is so decided.

I now give the floor to Mr. Ole Peter Kolby, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.

Mr. Kolby: Let me start by underlining the fact that I am speaking in my personal capacity and not on behalf of the members of the 661 Committee.

During the past two years, the volume of work of the Committee has continued to increase. The Committee has dealt with a wide range of issues of a complex and diverse nature. Due to the complexity of the issues on the agenda, the meetings of the 661 Committee have often been marked by frank discussion and even controversies. We have not been able to achieve results on all issues, but we have been able to handle the work, I believe, to the benefit of the Iraqi people, while implementing loyally the different resolutions of the Council.

The Committee has attached high priority to the processing of contracts submitted under the oil-for-food programme. Much of the Committee's attention has been focused on the question of holds on contracts, and the Committee has completed its series of informal meetings on sectorial activities, with presentations by the United Nations agencies and programmes concerned.

Earlier this year, the Security Council put into operation the Goods Review List and a new set of procedures, thereby easing the flow of humanitarian goods into Iraq. This was a milestone during my tenure as Chairman, and I would like to pay tribute to the members of the Council who worked so hard to make it possible to adopt resolution 1409 (2002).

The Office of the Iraq Programme, the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission and the International Atomic Energy

Agency have ensured a smooth transition to the revised procedures on schedule, and I would like to pay tribute to them as well.

The implementation of the Goods Review List and its procedures has brought about much-needed improvement in the flow of goods into Iraq. However, the benefits have, to some extent, been affected by a shortfall in the funding for the humanitarian programme. The funding shortfall has been of great concern to the Committee. The question of maximizing revenues for the humanitarian programme has been extensively discussed in the 661 Committee.

A great deal of time has also been devoted to discussing reported violations of the sanctions, as well as to humanitarian exemptions under resolution 661, passenger shipping services and flights to Iraq, and application of Article 50 of the Charter. For further details on the work of the Committee in this regard, I would like to draw the Council's attention to the various reports submitted to the Council by the Committee.

Since 1 January 2001, the Committee has held 33 formal meetings. As Chairman, I have given oral briefings to interested missions and to the press about the work of the Committee after each formal meeting. The Committee has also held frequent informal consultations at the expert level.

As the Secretary-General said in his report to the Council dated 12 November, the humanitarian Programme in Iraq was not intended to be a substitute for normal economic activity. As long as the sanctions remain in force, there is no alternative to the Programme for addressing the humanitarian situation in Iraq. Despite its shortcomings, the Programme has made, and continues to make, a major difference in the lives of ordinary Iraqis.

Let me conclude by extending my deep gratitude to the Executive Director of the Office of the Iraq Programme, Mr. Benon Sevan, and his staff and to the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Jingzhang Wan, and others in the Security Council Subsidiary Organs Branch. Their support and guidance has been invaluable.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Ambassador Kolby for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Ambassador Richard Ryan, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola.

Mr. Ryan: The Committee established pursuant to resolution 864 (1993) concerning the situation in Angola was, of course, dissolved last week by the Security Council on adoption of resolution 1448 (2002). I cannot, therefore, speak as Chairman of the 864 Committee, as it no longer exists. Even if it did exist, I believe the comments I make here today could be made only in a personal or national capacity. There will, of course, be the annual report of the 864 Committee. I believe, in fact, that Council members will already have received a draft copy.

The circumstances surrounding the termination of the 864 Committee are happy ones, the sort that the international community hopes for. The positive military and political developments in Angola since early this year provided the Council with the basis to take the welcome action that it did last week. It is difficult to measure precisely how much impact the Council's sanctions — and, by extension, the 864 Committee's efforts — had on events in Angola. I believe, though, it is right to say that the Council's efforts did indeed have some influence on what has transpired.

Perhaps the most straightforward measure to use is to contrast how the international community was implementing the sanctions at the beginning of 1999 with the situation at the beginning of 2002. For a number of years previously, we had witnessed widespread, if not total, disregard for the Council's measures against UNITA. That prolonged the conflict in Angola, and it did nothing to enhance the reputation of the Council or of the United Nations. It will be recalled that, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Fowler of Canada, a whole new dynamic was introduced to this file. I will not retrace the details here. In summary, though, the Council, through its innovative resolution 1295 (2000), put the international community on notice that the sanctions against UNITA should no longer be treated as a paper tiger: impunity would be met with the full force of the resolutions concerned.

Resolution 1295 (2000) provided for a number of steps. None was more important in providing the sanctions regime with teeth than the establishment in July 2000 of the Monitoring Mechanism on Angola Sanctions. The Mechanism allowed the sanctions

Committee to be furnished with additional and detailed information about the violations of the sanctions and to investigate where that information led. Its very existence sent a strong warning that the Committee had an additional arm that would systematically and constantly monitor sanctions violations and the violators. I am convinced that this acted as a strong deterrent to those who had already engaged in sanctions-busting, or who might have considered doing so. I would like to pay personal tribute to the dedication and the work of Ambassador Juan Larrain, the Chairman of the Monitoring Mechanism, and his colleagues in the Mechanism.

The harmonious atmosphere of the 864 Committee and the related absence of political differences on the conflict in Angola itself were important contributing factors to the success of its work. As Chairman of the Committee, I took the view, which was supported by all members, that a firewall of sorts should exist between the sanctions regime and the political track being pursued by the Secretary-General. It was, in my view, crucial to maintain the distinction between the Committee's work and that political track. The dovetailing of these lines that has occurred in the past few weeks, when the sanctions regime and the work of the Joint Commission set up under the Lusaka Protocol overlapped, was an inevitable and welcome development in the circumstances. But, until that historic moment, it was important for our joint objectives to avoid any entanglement. And I believe that this has worked very well.

The Committee's united approach opened the way in September 2001 for the adoption of a revised list of senior UNITA officials and adult members of their immediate families. Those whose names appeared on the list were subject to travel and financial restrictions. A renewed signal of the Committee's seriousness was being sent to UNITA and its supporters. Directly arising from this, seven United Nations Member States froze bank accounts of individuals included in the list.

The Committee also engaged a private sector organization to investigate UNITA's international financial networks. Although the investigation did not reveal significant new information on UNITA's financial operations, another strong signal was, I believe, being sent to UNITA and to the international financial community of the Council's determination to close off as many avenues as possible.

The cooperation of Committee members and other Member States extended well beyond New York. In my capacity as Chairman, I visited 11 States, where I raised, often at Government level, the priorities of the sanctions Committee. Such visits proved extremely useful for familiarization and direct contact with Governments and other interested parties, both to gather information and to convey the message of the Security Council's continuing determination in seeing the implementation of its measures.

An important aspect of the sanctions Committee's work in the past two years has been the high level of cooperation it received from the Government of Angola. It is no secret that the relationship between the United Nations and Angola has not always been a happy one. However, I believe that the work of the Committee and the impact this had on eroding UNITA's capacity to wage war have increased the credibility of the United Nations and of the Security Council in Angola's eyes.

The Angolan authorities played their part in this, particularly over the past two years, when they engaged in bilateral discussions with a number of States that had provided support to UNITA. The African Union also played a part, establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on the Implementation of Sanctions Against UNITA, which visited a number of States, including some that had caused concern to the Monitoring Mechanism. I, myself, had a number of useful meetings with the Ad Hoc Committee.

As Chairman, I followed very closely the Kimberley Process, with its focus on the diamond industry, and I engaged with the Wasenaar arrangement, given its focus on weapons. Both of these areas were central to the Angolan conflict. Although there are highly complex issues at stake, including valuable commercial interests, I am pleased to note that significant advances were made by the Kimberley Process. Some of the same issues — for example, in the marking of weapons and the registration of weapons dealers and brokers — should be addressed more urgently in the weapons field.

The 864 Committee and its investigative arm grappled with many sensitive and complicated aspects that have not been without controversy. Matters such as the compilation of lists of individuals subject to financial and travel restrictions, the use of outside contractors to assist in the work of the Committee, the

role of arms brokers, the capacity and willingness of the diamond industry to police itself better and how to encourage individual Member States to take action in support of the sanctions regime have all given plenty of cause for thought. Many of these issues remain the subject of debate and, perhaps out of necessity, or for other reasons, can be dealt with only on a case-by-case basis.

An issue that I would like to add to the sanctions agenda is what line the Council should take towards sanctions-busters when a sanctions regime has been dissolved. In such circumstances, is the Council prepared to allow past transgressions to be quietly forgotten or, in the interest of deterrence, should the Council contemplate pursuing the transgressors? If follow-up activity is required, the question of who would carry this out raises itself.

It is not my intention to provoke a debate on a permanent monitoring structure. However, the issue of follow-up is a legitimate one to raise. We believe it is an important element in favour of a permanent body which could collect evidence and intelligence and help create an institutional memory within the United Nations in this regard.

Many of the issues raised in the work of the 864 Committee have simultaneously occupied the time of other sanctions committees, most notably those dealing with Sierra Leone and Liberia. On balance, the more imaginative and, frankly, more intrusive methods adopted by the Council and its committees in the period since the publication of the Fowler Report in March 2000, and the adoption one month later of resolution 1295 (2000), have paid real dividends. The advances should not lead to complacency, however. Innovative thinking and refinement of practice could possibly lead to further success.

I know from my time as Chairman of the 864 Committee, and as a representative of a member of the Council, that there is plenty of thinking going on inside and outside the Council in New York and elsewhere. I would encourage this to continue and, where profitable, use of the experience offered by the work of the 864 Committee to allow sanctions to play a positive role in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Now I will give a briefing in my capacity as Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). Since the responsibility of chairing the committees is a personal one, I am presenting this report as have Ambassadors Kolby and Ryan, who spoke before me.

In the last two years I have had the opportunity of chairing the 1267 Committee, previously known as the Committee on Afghanistan. The name change is significant for this Committee because it reflects the developments that have turned it into an instrument of global scope in order to tackle the terrorist network that is one of the greatest challenges to international peace and security today.

I will begin by talking about the dedicated efforts of all the members of the Committee as well as for the support work provided by the Secretariat. The report on the work I carried out in 2001 was published under document S/2002/101. The report on this year's work will be published in the coming days. I would also like to mention the reports of the Monitoring Group, the last of which was submitted to the Committee last week and will shortly be distributed as a Security Council document.

The 1267 Committee has, besides its global scope, another special characteristic, since it is the only active sanctions committee established to fight terrorism, in particular Osama bin Laden, Al Qaeda, the Taliban and their associates.

The first sanctions against the Taliban were applied almost two years before 11 September. The measures were later extended to Al Qaeda. The different acts of terrorism in the last two years — among which the events of 11 September of last year will continue to be stressed — have raised a few questions on the role of the Security Council with respect to the challenge of strongly responding to the danger of these organizations. Was there a lack of information? Was there no decision? Should the Council act preventively?

I can assure the Council that we have been lacking in meeting our responsibilities vis-à-vis the challenges of terrorism. That is why I now make a plea to make up for lost time in complying with our duties as the Security Council and in general as Members of the United Nations.

In January of this year the Council adopted resolution 1390 (2002), which extended the scope of coverage of sanctions to a global level. The comprehensiveness of the sanctions is a special

characteristic of this regime and one of the main differences from other current sanctions regimes. This raises serious challenges for its implementation.

As we have said on other occasions, the fight against terrorism must be preventive in nature in order to be effective. Capturing the person responsible for planting a bomb is undeniably a positive act of justice. But it is even better to prevent a terrorist act from ever taking place.

In its activity the Committee has had to deal with the claims and requests from people who have allegedly been unfairly affected by the application of sanctions. In this respect, I must say that this is not an easy discussion. But in any case, it is clear that neither the Committee nor the international community can limit itself to exhausting all the judicial procedures to sentence someone after a terrorist act has been committed. Even though we realize that we have to act with sufficient precautions in order to prevent arbitrary actions, it is just as true that we must develop very skilful preventive efforts and make them more thorough. In this respect, the guidelines adopted by the Committee on 7 November provide procedures for including new names on the list, as well as for excluding names.

The present sanctions regime has three elements: the freezing of financial resources, travel bans, and arms embargoes.

With respect to the freezing of resources, it is not easy to try to have a conclusive assessment of the results achieved. Nonetheless, as is said in the Monitoring Group's report, Al Qaeda still has access to considerable financial and economic resources. We have to use our imagination in order to come up with ways to make this measure more effective.

As for the travel ban, thus far we have not received any information on people on the Committee list who have tried to travel and have been rejected because of this measure. Nevertheless, the Monitoring Group has drawn the attention of the members of the Committee to the need for the Committee list to be used in a specific manner by the immigration authorities of Member countries. For this, the list must be as accurate as possible.

The experts have also drawn the attention of the Committee to how easy it is in certain countries to legally change a name. Additionally, we have to think about a set of recommendations on what immigration authorities in any country should do when they find themselves facing someone who is on the list. Can that person be arrested? Do they send him back where he came from? What can they do?

The third measure, the arms embargo, is also difficult to apply in isolation. The experts' recommendations are in line with the recommendations that have come up in various forums where illegal arms trafficking, in particular in small arms and light weapons, has been discussed. The different expert groups that monitor the sanctions regimes imposed by the Security Council have made similar recommendations. It would be fitting to have a discussion on these recommendations, in particular since they have the advantage of arising from the concrete experience of the experts in these monitoring groups in dealing with arms embargoes in specific cases.

The list of people and entities associated with the Taliban, with Al Qaeda or with Osama bin Laden is the main instrument the Committee has. At this point, the list has 232 individuals and 92 entities subject to sanctions. It is clear that we have to make additional efforts to try to make the list more specific and truly usable.

There is another aspect that needs to be emphasized. The Monitoring Group has detected at least 104 names of individuals who are not on the list and who, according to information from the press or other sources, have been identified as or accused of having ties with Al Qaeda. Some of these are even under arrest. Here, I would like to point out that Member States have obligations with respect to providing information to the Committee. This question should receive special consideration next month, when we must consider the extension of the mandate.

With respect to cooperation received from Member States, the results have been moderate. In addition to the remaining names to be included in the list, to which I referred a moment ago, 80 reports have been received from Member States. However, more and more countries are submitting to the Committee requests to add names to the list. As mentioned in the report of the Committee, 59 delegations have submitted requests of this kind to the Committee.

I have referred on various occasions to the reports of the Monitoring Group. Those reports contain

recommendations requiring the direct action of the 1267 Committee, as well as other recommendations of a general nature, to be taken into consideration by Member States. Next January, in conformity with the provisions of paragraph 3 of resolution 1390 (2002), the Council must review the sanctions imposed in order to evaluate their effectiveness and, if necessary, to modify or strengthen them.

I wish to stress, as we have done on previous occasions, that the Security Council must be more active in its work related to the functions of the 1267 Committee — namely, the activities and work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) — in particular, by preparing actions and decisions against States, individuals and organizations directly or indirectly involved in terrorist activities. In other words, we must move from a general framework of cooperation to the implementation of measures by considering specific cases. To do that, the CTC's mandate will require review and modification. This is an area in which we have not yet been able to establish real points of contact and exchange. In an ideal world of effective cooperation, the existence of the CTC should contribute to the effectiveness of the 1267 Committee. However, it is obvious that there is still a gap between the framework of cooperation created by the CTC and effective implementation in specific cases, which is the domain of the 1267 Committee.

In conclusion, allow me to underline that, although international terrorism is not a new phenomenon, after 11 September 2001 it took on the added dimension of a challenge to international peace and security. The recent terrorist attacks in Indonesia and in Kenya, among others, have also had the result of raising the international community's awareness of the fact that we are facing a global phenomenon. This challenge requires us to be more proactive and vigilant and to find innovative mechanisms to combat it.

I now resume my functions of President of the Security Council.

I now give the floor to Mr. Kishore Mahbubani, Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1343 (2001) concerning Liberia.

Mr. Mahbubani: Let me begin by commending you, Mr. President, for organizing this meeting, which we believe is a very useful one to have, primarily because there is no formal mechanism for handing over the chairmanship of a Security Council committee. In our case, for example, we do not know who the next Chairman of the Liberia sanctions Committee will be. So, the purpose of our remarks today is to try and help the incoming Chairman do his work when he takes on the chairmanship of the Committee. In doing so, let me stress, as you have and as have Ambassador Kolby and Ambassador Ryan, that I will be speaking in a personal capacity and none other.

By way of background, there are at present only three United Nations Member States that are subjected to sanctions on the State itself. In the other cases, the sanctions have either been lifted or suspended or have been imposed on non-State actors. Those three States are Iraq, Liberia and Somalia. Of course, the sanctions on Iraq are a much bigger job. The sanctions on Liberia are a much smaller job. I admire the work that Ambassador Kolby has done.

In our case, three measures were imposed on Liberia: the expansion of the 1992 arms embargo by resolution 1343 (2001) of 7 March 2001; the May 2001 embargo on the direct and indirect import of all rough diamonds from Liberia; and a travel ban on senior Liberian Government members, senior military officers and their spouses, and individuals providing financial and military support to rebel groups in the region, as designated by the sanctions Committee. All three measures were extended for another year in May 2002 by resolution 1408 (2002).

Allow me to comment briefly on the question of the performance of the Committee. Basically, as we said to the Council in formal consultations, we have good news and bad news. The good news is that we have probably succeeded in achieving the objective described in paragraph 3 of resolution 1343 (2001), which "Stresses that the demands in paragraph 2 above are intended to lead to further progress in the peace process in Sierra Leone". As we all know, the good news is that the peace process in Sierra Leone has gone well, especially since President Kabbah declared the end of the war in January this year and since Sierra Leone also successfully completed its elections in May this year.

The bad news is that the three Panel of Experts reports have documented continued violations of the sanctions by the Government of Liberia and by other groups, including the Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD). That creates, I

suppose, a dilemma for the Council next year in terms of weighing the political considerations of the goals achieved against the legal considerations of the continuing violations. That is the challenge that the Council will face next year.

Turning to the Committee's work for next year, we have tried to document the lessons that we have learned. We have come up with seven lessons, which we would like to share with the Council.

The first lesson is that it is very important for any Chairman of a sanctions committee to visit the region. There is absolutely no substitute for first-hand, direct contact with the country on which sanctions have been imposed and with the other countries in the region. In that regard, I must say that we had a very useful visit in April 2001, and I congratulate the Secretariat on the remarkable work they did in organizing our visit. For me, going to the region was an eye-opener. When I arrived there, I explained to all the Liberians that we met that the Security Council had imposed some very smart sanctions: an arms embargo, a diamond embargo and the travel ban. Yet I found, as I will discuss later, that the sanctions also had a psychological impact on the population as a whole. That is something that one can discover only by going to the region oneself. It is something to which we should pay attention.

The second lesson we learned is that it is important to have a comprehensive policy for any sanctions arrangement. Sanctions alone cannot be the sole policy of the Council. Frankly, in the case of Liberia, that is one problem that we constantly had: not knowing exactly where the sanctions fitted into the overall policy of the Council. But that problem has been solved by Ambassador Aguilar Zinser. I want to congratulate him and the Mexican delegation on having succeeded in persuading the Council to adopt, on 13 December 2002, the presidential statement contained in document S/PRST/2002/36. We think that it is a very important complement to the work being done on sanctions in Liberia.

The third lesson we have learned is that it is extremely important for a sanctions committee to be provided with adequate resources. Here, the problem that any sanctions committee has — because I am sure that this applies to others, too — is that we clearly do not have the resources to monitor whether or not the sanctions are being respected. In the case of the Liberia Sanctions Committee, we had to rely upon the ad hoc Panel of Experts that was set up. But the problem with those panels of experts is that they work on what I call a stop-start basis. They are suddenly jump-started, they work for three months, they come up with a report and then they stop their work. Then there is a gap. When we need more information, we jump-start them again, they work for a few months and then they stop again. That process of stopping and starting creates problems, because what happens, for example, is that you lose some of the expertise. We lost the chairman of our Panel of Experts and, in due course, we also lost one of the experts, the Interpol expert.

So information is lost when the panels are disbanded. That is why we have recommended that an early decision be made next year to set up this Panel because the more time that it is given, the better work it does. I want to stress for the record that, despite the fact that they have to work under unsatisfactory conditions, it is remarkable what valuable and insightful reports those panels have presented to the Council.

The fourth lesson we learned was about the difficulties in the implementation of sanctions. I will talk briefly about the arms and diamonds embargoes and the travel ban. In the case of the arms embargo, I think we all know — and it is documented in the most recent report of the Panel of Experts — that the arms embargo is being visibly flouted both by the Government of Liberia and by Liberians United for Reconciliation and Democracy (LURD). Indeed, the latest period report states that, between June and August 2002, more than 200 tons of weapons and ammunition arrived in Liberia. In the same report, it was also mentioned in paragraph 7 that the Panel had observed that arms also continued to reach LURD rebels through neighbouring countries. So, clearly, the arms embargo is not functioning as it should and something has to be done by the Council in that regard.

Also, not enough attention is being given by the Council to the implementation of the provisions of paragraph 4 of resolution 1343 (2001), which demands that all States in the region prevent armed groups from using their territory to prepare and launch attacks on neighbouring countries.

Let me also raise one specific problem that arises from the procedures used by the Panel of Experts. The fundamental method they use is "naming and shaming". They name the countries involved and they

hope that that will prevent the countries from violating the arms embargo. But sometimes, in some cases, the countries have come back and said that they need more information, or have asked if they can explain what happened. Then we arrive at a practical problem, because when the Panel's mandate has expired, the Panel has been disbanded and there is no mechanism available within the Secretariat to deal with responses from Member States or individuals who dispute the allegations contained in the Panel's reports or to deal with requests from Member States and individuals named in those reports who seek further information on those allegations.

Here, I want to endorse the point made by Ambassador Ryan that the Council has to address the problem of continuity on this issue and clearly retain the expertise to deal with complaints from Member States. One specific suggestion I would have is, for example, if indeed the Panel of Experts is set up again, we should at least retain one of the experts to respond to queries from Member States, if they raise questions about the reports of the Panel of Experts.

Secondly, on the diamonds embargo, there clearly is also evidence that it has not been working very well. There is a reverse trend of Liberian diamonds being smuggled out of Liberia and sold as diamonds to neighbouring countries. I also want to mention that, despite the explicit call in the resolution for Liberia to set up a diamonds certification system, the technical assistance for that has not been forthcoming. In addition, one problem that will also need to be addressed is the fact that the diamond embargoes imposed by the Council and the international control regime set up by the Kimberly Process may not necessarily be working in harmony and there is a need to harmonize those two tracks also.

Thirdly, clearly, of all the sanctions imposed on Liberia, the most effective measure was the travel ban. That is what clearly hurt the Government of Liberia more than anything else. It is also in a way the most controversial, because there is no fixed criteria for the listing and de-listing of names on the travel-ban list. Consequently, individuals are usually proposed for the travel-ban list through the provision of information by some members of a sanctions Committee, and the other members of the Committee generally agree to the inclusion or deletion of names on the basis of trust.

But, because there are no clear rules for listing or de-listing, situations arise where a name that ought to be put on the list is withheld because of the objection of a single member, or a name that could be deleted is retained for the same reason. I think there needs to be a more transparent process in the Committee for the designation or deletion of names from the travel-ban list. It is very difficult, frankly, when one is chairman of such a committee to be confronted with an individual who writes you a long passionate letter explaining why he should be removed from the list, and you have to reply to him saying, sorry, we cannot agree to this, when you can give him no reasons for this.

The other problem we had with the travel-ban list is that we often had skimpy information on the individuals on the travel-ban list and countries have complained that they could not impose the travel ban when they have been given just the name and designation, without passport numbers and so forth. We hope that that will also be addressed in the future.

Let me turn now to the fifth lesson we learned, which is the unintended consequences of sanctions. As I mentioned earlier, the sanctions that were imposed on Liberia were intended to be smart sanctions and were not intended to have any kind of adverse impact on the population of Liberia. But, as I hinted earlier, they have had a psychological impact on the population, and the sad truth is that at about the same time that the sanctions were imposed on Liberia, the humanitarian situation in Liberia worsened. The most recent report of the Panel of Experts makes it very clear that the humanitarian crisis in Liberia is not a result of the sanctions that were imposed. That is very clearly established by the most recent report of the Panel of Experts. But, at the same time, it also makes it clear that Liberia is facing a serious humanitarian crisis and that humanitarian assistance to Liberia has decreased. That is something that clearly has to be addressed.

Of course, the Government of Liberia has taken advantage of this humanitarian crisis to wage a successful propaganda campaign in Liberia to convince the Liberian population that the humanitarian problems that they face are due to United Nations sanctions. There is one thing the Council can do better next year, and that is to fight that propaganda battle and convince the Liberian population that their problems are not due to the sanctions imposed on them.

The sixth lesson that we learned has to do with one of the instructions given to us when the Committee was set up and contained in paragraph 14 (c) of resolution 1343 (2001), which states that we should, as a Committee:

> "promulgate expeditiously such guidelines as may be necessary to facilitate the implementation of the measures imposed by paragraphs 5 to 7 above."

Unfortunately, after two years, we have not been able to agree on the guidelines for the Committee. The good news is that that did not deter the work of the Committee. We managed to get our work done, despite the absence of guidelines. But that situation is clearly unsatisfactory and it is something that will hopefully be remedied in due course. But, as we all know, a similar problem has also been holding up the work in the Working Group on sanctions. We hope that that Working Group on sanctions will find the solution to the problem of establishing clear guidelines.

The seventh and final lesson, which ties into the point of our institutional memory, is about support. We want, at this point, to thank the Secretariat for the tremendous support they give us, in particular to Loraine Rickard-Martin, James Sutterlin and Armie Decepida, without whom, frankly, our sanctions Committee could not have worked. They did a tremendous job, and we want to thank them for it. But as we leave, we want to encourage them to work harder with our successors and to continue to provide them good advice, because, frankly, the sanctions Committee relies a great deal on the Secretariat for its work.

I now give the floor to Ambassador Jagdish Koonjul, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa.

Mr. Koonjul: For the same reasons that Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani mentioned earlier, I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this meeting. I welcome this opportunity to provide a briefing on the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, over which I had the honour to preside for the past 10 months.

As members will recall, the Working Group was established following the public meeting on the situation in Africa held last January with the participation of His Excellency Mr. Amara Essy, Secretary-General of the then Organization of African Unity — now the African Union — and of several ministerial delegations, which led to the Security Council's adoption of presidential statement S/PRST/2002/2. That presidential statement requested the Council to give serious consideration to the setting up of an ad hoc working group to monitor the recommendations contained in the statement and to enhance coordination and cooperation with the Economic and Social Council — whose President, by the way, participated in a Council meeting for the first time on that occasion.

The Security Council subsequently established the Working Group in February with the following mandate: first, to monitor the implementation of recommendations contained in the presidential statement and in previous presidential statements and resolutions regarding conflict prevention and resolution in Africa; secondly, to propose recommendations on the enhancement of cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council as well as with other United Nations agencies dealing with Africa; thirdly, to examine, in particular, regional and cross-conflict issues that affect the Security Council's work on African conflict prevention and resolution; and fourthly, to propose recommendations to the Security Council aimed at enhancing cooperation in conflict prevention and resolution between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity as well as with other subregional organizations.

The very first meeting of the Working Group, which was held at the ambassadorial level, provided an opportunity for a very rich exchange of views and a powerful brainstorming session, which in turn gave the Group a general sense of direction and the broad parameters of its work. It was agreed that, in fulfilling its mandate, the Working Group would not duplicate the Security Council's work but would rather bring added value to it by looking at issues of importance to Africa, which generally are not adequately discussed in the Council.

In May, under the Singaporean presidency of the Council, I had the opportunity to present the Working Group's programme of work to the general membership at a public briefing presided over by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Singapore. The debate that followed confirmed the general membership's approbation of the relevance of the Working Group and of the work programme that I had outlined. Here, I should like to express my gratitude for the wide support and

encouragement that my Working Group received from the general membership at that meeting. I am also thankful to the Singaporean presidency for the very succinct report that it presented at the end of the meeting.

After a number of meetings, my Working Group presented a first set of recommendations to the Security Council in August this year (*see S/2002/979, annex*); they related to a group of friends, to cooperation with the African Union and to Guinea-Bissau.

In brief, with regard to the group of friends, the Working Group based its discussions on background information provided by the Department of Political Affairs on the work of the Group of Friends of the Secretary-General as well as on the experiences of Member States that had launched similar groups.

On cooperation with the African Union, the Working Group discussed extensively the question of enhancing cooperation between the Security Council and the African Union. In that regard, the Working Group heard the views of the Permanent Observer of the African Union in New York and formulated a number of recommendations. I am pleased to report that there is now general and greater awareness among Council members of the African Union's activities with respect to conflicts in Africa.

With regard to Guinea-Bissau, the Working Group had a rich exchange of views with the participation of the Permanent Representative of Guinea-Bissau, the President of the Economic and Social Council, the Department of Political Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme, the International Peace Academy and the Permanent Representative of the Gambia, who acted as Chair of the Group of Friends on Guinea-Bissau. After discussing Guinea-Bissau's current peace-building needs and the obstacles that were being encountered by that country in addressing those needs, the Working Group made a number of practical recommendations.

A second set of recommendations, relating to the enhancement of the effectiveness of the Representatives and Special Representatives of the Secretary-General in Africa, were made by the Working Group on 9 December (*see S/2002/1352, annex*). While preparing those recommendations, the Working Group consulted with the Department of Political Affairs, the Office of the African Union and the Office of the Secretary-General. I should like to stress here that the recommendations concerning Representatives and Special Representatives of the Secretary-General do not in any way reflect the performance of existing Representatives and Special Representatives but are intended to suggest ways and means to enhance their effectiveness.

The Working Group also held briefing sessions on the New Partnership for Africa's Development and on the activities of the United Nations Electoral Assistance Division in order to provide the delegations of Council members with a better understanding of those issues while they deal with their work in the Council. In addition, the International Crisis Group was invited to brief the members of the Working Group on the Mano River Union prior to the workshop that the United Kingdom presidency organized in the month of July.

The most significant achievement of the Working Group has been the promotion of close cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. Indeed, there is a growing recognition that the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should cooperate and coordinate their activities for lasting solutions to conflicts. It was in that spirit that the President of the Economic and Social Council was invited to participate in the public meeting of the Security Council on the situation in Africa in January and in the meetings that the Working Group held subsequently.

Likewise, the President of the Economic and Social Council invited me, in my capacity as Chair of the Security Council's Working Group, to participate in the Economic and Social Council's commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the General Peace Agreement for Mozambique, which was held on 4 October 2002. More recently, at the invitation of the Economic and Social Council, I participated in the joint Security Council-Economic and Social Council mission to Guinea-Bissau with the Economic and Social Council Ad Hoc Advisory Group on African Countries Emerging from Conflict. We had a very constructive meeting in Guinea-Bissau, and later in Washington with the Bretton Woods institutions, and it is hoped that very useful recommendations will be made that will help Guinea-Bissau. Such joint activity illustrates the close cooperation that we have been able to establish between those two important organs of the United Nations.

As the Mauritius membership of the Council will be ending this month, and since the Working Group will come up for review in February next year, I should like, in my personal capacity, to make certain observations on the future of the Working Group. In our opinion, the Working Group's informal nature makes it an ideal forum for discussion of issues relating to Africa, especially because the Group invites speakers from various organizations to brainstorm on African issues. Although the Security Council spends most of its time on African issues, it hardly has the time to devote itself to in-depth discussions. The Working Group compensates for that shortcoming. With the events of 11 September 2001 and other pressing problems that the Council must address — combined with a number of positive developments in Africa — there may be a tendency to move the focus away from African problems. The Working Group, we feel, will greatly help in maintaining the focus on African issues.

The link that has been created by the Working Group with the Economic and Social Council will not, we believe, survive on its own. The cooperation between the two Councils is of vital importance, and the Working Group can provide the vital link for the continuation of such cooperation. The approach that the Working Group and the Economic and Social Council have taken with regard to Guinea-Bissau can also be applied to many other countries emerging from conflict, such as, for example, the Central African Republic, Burundi, Angola and even Liberia at some stage in the future.

The African Union and subregional organizations in Africa are important partners of the Security Council with respect to dealing with conflicts in Africa. We believe that the Working Group can be of significant importance in strengthening the partnership among the Security Council, the African Union and subregional organizations in Africa. It is therefore our view that there is merit in maintaining and in strengthening the Working Group well beyond its current mandate. We also believe that the dialogue that was initiated with the African Union by inviting the Secretary-General of the African Union to participate in the Council's public meeting last January, should continue. We certainly hope that next year the new Council will follow up on that.

Finally, I would like to thank all Council members for the support which they have given me in the Working Group. I would like, in particular, to thank the Department of Political Affairs — Assistant Secretary-General Kalomoh and Ms. Vogt — as well as the whole Secretariat team for the continuous assistance that they have provided to the Working Group. I would like to make a special mention of the support that I received from Ambassador Gerry Corr, the Deputy Permanent Representative of Ireland, for the comprehensive paper that he presented on the New Partnership for Africa's Development, from the United States delegation, in particular Mr. Rick Mills, for their contribution on the role of Special Representatives of the Secretary-General. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the members of my own team, in particular Mr. Jingree, for their dedicated support, which made the work of my Committee easier, and for the recommendations which we have made in regard to the work of the Working Group. We certainly hope that Council members will give serious consideration next year to continuing the Working Group and even to strengthening it further.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I now give the floor to Ambassador Wegger Christian Strømmen, Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

Mr. Strømmen: The Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations conducted a total of eight formal meetings in 2002, including one meeting with troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) — commonly known as the new mechanism — which was held on 28 August.

By means of a note by the President of the Security Council of 14 January this year (S/2002/56), the Council adopted the mandate of the new mechanism for cooperation with troop-contributing countries, set out as an integral part of the mandate of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping. This represented the culmination of a year-long process aimed at strengthening cooperation and consultation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries.

Following the adoption of that note, the Working Group was not given any immediate tasks by the Council. Consequently, no meetings were held before the end of May this year. The Working Group then met to discuss two non-papers, introduced by the United Kingdom and the Russian Federation respectively, on

how to improve military advice to the Security Council. The need for enhanced and improved military advice to the Council was acknowledged by members of the Group. However, it was not possible to reach any agreement on the recommendations put forward in the non-papers.

Given a couple of incidents relating to actors wishing to participate in troop contributors' meetings in accordance with resolution 1353 (2001), the Working Group was tasked to elaborate an approach aimed at avoiding such incidents in the future. The response by the Working Group, adopted in the note by the President (S/2002/964) of 27 August, was an attempt to establish a coherent and inclusive practice in this field. The note outlines that actors listed in annex II.B of resolution 1353 (2001), which do not have an automatic right to participate in the mentioned meetings, should make a request for participation to the President of the Council, and that the President, following consultations with Council members, should extend an invitation as appropriate and instruct the Secretariat accordingly. It now rests on all actors involved to implement that new procedure.

I will now turn to the meeting of the so-called new mechanism for cooperation with troop-contributing countries held on 28 August. As Council members will recall, this was the first meeting held in this new format. As Chairman of the Working Group, I am pleased to note that the meeting was generally appraised in positive terms by Council members and troop contributors alike. It was pointed out that the meeting gave rise to a more substantive debate compared to the consultation meetings under resolution 1353 (2001), and that the smaller format and the specific, well-defined agenda item contributed to a fruitful exchange of views among Council members, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat.

The experience gained so far suggests that such meetings are not likely to overburden the Council or to interfere with its prerogatives. On the contrary, in my view, the new format has its merits, and efforts should be made towards its further improvement. I would therefore encourage close contact and consultations among Council members, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat with a view to organizing further meetings of the mechanism when this is deemed appropriate. This will, not least, serve the important purpose of strengthening the much-needed partnership between those who design and those who implement the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Towards the end of the year, the Working Group informally discussed possible topics which should form the basis for future elaboration, with the overall aim of improving practices within United Nations peacekeeping. In that regard, challenges relating to command and control in peacekeeping operations, lessons learned, and disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and rehabilitation have been raised by members. However, it has been underlined that before any debate can be launched, the specific challenges to be addressed should be clearly defined, taking due account of the mandate of the Working Group as well as the mandates of other relevant bodies in order not to duplicate efforts. This preparatory work is currently ongoing, and the Working Group might therefore wish to revisit it under its new Chair.

The Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations is a standing organ under the Security Council mandated to consider both generic and mission-specific aspects of peacekeeping operations. As the outgoing Chairman, I take the view that the Security Council would benefit from continued input from the Working Group in both these areas as a means to strengthen United Nations peacekeeping capacity.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank Mr. Strømmen for his briefing on the work of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.20 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.4674

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4674th meeting

Wednesday, 18 December 2002, 11.20 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Su Wei
	France	Mr. Duclos
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Corr
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mrs. Arce de Jeannet
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Mekdad
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74660 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January 1994 and 31 December 1994

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations. After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council takes note of the report to the Security Council dated 23 July 2002 of the Prosecutor of the International Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) (S/2002/938), of the letter to the President of the Security Council dated 26 July 2002 from the President of the ICTR (S/2002/847), of the letter to the President of the Security Council dated 26 July 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, enclosing the reply of the Rwandan Government to the Prosecutor's report (S/2002/842), of the letter to the President of the Security Council dated 8 August 2002 from the President of the ICTR, enclosing a Note of the ICTR on the reply of the Rwandan Government (S/2002/923), and of the letter to the President of the Security Council dated 17 September 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Rwanda, enclosing a letter from the Association of Survivors of Rwandan genocide (S/2002/1043).

"The Security Council also takes note of the letter to the President of the Security Council dated 23 October 2002 from the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and of the letter to the President of the Security Council dated 25 October 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Yugoslavia to the United Nations, enclosing a Non-Paper.

"The Security Council reaffirms its support for the ICTR and ICTY (the Tribunals), impartial and independent bodies, which contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and to bringing justice and reconciliation to the people of the countries concerned.

"The Security Council recalls the mandatory obligation of all States, including the Governments of Rwanda and Yugoslavia, under resolutions 955 (1994) and 827 (1993) and the Statutes of the Tribunals, to cooperate fully with the Tribunals and their organs, including the duty to comply with the requests by the Tribunals for the arrest or detention of indictees and their surrender or transfer to the Tribunals, to make witnesses available to the Tribunals, and to assist with the Tribunals' ongoing investigations.

"The Security Council stresses the importance it attaches to the full cooperation by all States, particularly those directly concerned, with the Tribunals.

"The Security Council also stresses the importance of constructive dialogue between the Tribunals and the Governments concerned to resolve any outstanding issues affecting the work of the Tribunals that arise in the course of their cooperation but insists that such dialogue or lack of dialogue must not be used by States as an excuse for failure to discharge their obligations to cooperate fully with the Tribunals as required by Security Council resolutions and the Statutes of the Tribunals.

"The Security Council will remain seized of the matter."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2002/39.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.25 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.4675

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4675th meeting

Wednesday, 18 December 2002, 11.25 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Su Wei
	France	Mr. Duclas
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Corr
	Mauritius	Mr. Jingree
	Mexico	Mrs. Arce de Jeannet
	Norway	Mr. Strømmen
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Mekdad
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

The situation in Burundi

Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the situation in Burundi (S/2002/1259)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74711 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.25 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Burundi

Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the situation in Burundi (S/2002/1259)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Burundi in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nteturuye (Burundi) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2002/1259, which contains the report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the situation in Burundi.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council.

"The Security Council welcomes the signing of the ceasefire agreement between the Transitional Government of Burundi and the Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie-Front de défense de la démocratie (CNDD-FDD) on 2 December 2002 in Arusha ('the Ceasefire Agreement'). It pays tribute to the courageous and responsible decision by the President of the Transitional Government of Burundi, Mr. Buyoya, and by the legal representative of CNDD-FDD, Mr. Nkurunziza, to sign the agreement. It welcomes their decision to implement the truce immediately, while finalizing all pending political issues within the time limits set by the agreement.

"The Security Council supports the decision of the 19th regional Head of States summit of the Regional Initiative to direct the Palipehutu Forces Nationales de Libération (FNL) to enter into negotiation immediately and conclude a ceasefire agreement by 30 December 2002 or face the consequences. In this regard, the Council strongly urges the FNL, under the leadership of Mr. Rwasa, to put an end immediately to the hostilities, sign a ceasefire agreement and commit themselves to political negotiations. It recalls that the settlement of the crisis in Burundi depends on a political solution, and that only a negotiated settlement in the framework of the Arusha Agreement of 28 August 2000 will enable the country to restore stability, in accordance with the will of the Burundian people.

"The Security Council expresses its intention to support the immediate and full implementation of the agreements signed between the Burundian parties, in particular the Ceasefire Agreement of 2 December 2002. It requests the Secretary-General to study ways of responding positively and with urgency to the requests of the Burundian parties and of the Facilitator, the Deputy President of the Republic of South Africa, in particular with regard to:

"Any expertise and advice which the Secretariat could provide to facilitate the definition of the mandate and the deployment of the African mission provided for in the Ceasefire Agreement of 2 December;

"Facilitation of logistical assistance to the deployment of this mission;

"Mobilization and coordination of donor contributions;

"Designation, at the request of the parties, of a person to chair the Joint Ceasefire Commission.

"The Security Council emphasizes the merits of cooperation between the African mission and the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), in particular in the border area.

"The Security Council expresses its thanks for the historic role played by former President Mandela, pays tribute and expresses its full support to the efforts of the Republic of South Africa, in particular its Deputy President, Mr. Zuma, the Facilitator of the Burundian peace process. It pays tribute to the role of the African Union. It also pays tribute to the efforts of the Republic of Tanzania and of President Mkapa, President Bongo of Gabon, President Museveni of Uganda, and the other Regional Initiative countries. The Council also expresses its full support to the action taken by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Burundi and approves the recommendations of the Secretary-General, in paragraphs 47 to 51 of his report of 18 November 2002 (S/2002/1259), with a view to increasing the resources of the United Nations Office in Burundi.

"The Security Council recalls that the responsibility for the Burundi peace process lies primarily with the Burundian parties themselves. The parties must agree without further delay on the modalities of the reform of the army, as well as the political issues mentioned in annex 2 of the Ceasefire Agreement of 2 December 2002. The Council requests the parties to continue to respect their commitments. The Council condemns the human rights violations that have taken place in Burundi and calls for the perpetrators to be brought to justice.

"The Security Council recalls the joint communiqué issued by the Governments of Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 7 January 2002 (S/2002/36) expressing their intent to normalize their relations. It calls on them to finalize and implement an accord as soon as possible ensuring the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo will not be used for armed attacks against Burundi, as well as the effective withdrawal of Burundian troops from Congolese territory. It also notes that, as the Burundi parties have taken the bold step of reaching the 2 December 2002 Ceasefire Agreement, the Security Council stands ready to consider steps against States that are found to continue to support armed attacks by the Burundi rebels.

"The Security Council recalls that the support of the international community, in particular financial support, is critical to the success of the peace process. In that regard, it welcomes the success of the donor round table organized in Geneva on 27 and 28 November 2002, and calls on donors to respond urgently to the significant progress made recently and to disburse fully the contributions promised so far. In particular, it calls on donors to provide the necessary financial assistance to facilitate the return to development and financial stability, and to consolidate the substantial efforts deployed by the Burundian authorities in this regard.

"The Security Council pays tribute to the donors that are supporting the deployment of the South African Special Protection Unit, encourages them to continue their efforts and calls on the donor community to mobilize to help the countries concerned set up, as soon as possible and in liaison with the United Nations, the African mission provided for in the Ceasefire Agreement of 2 December 2002, and to participate in the financing of the repatriation and the reintegration of Burundian refugees.

"The Security Council strongly condemns all massacres and other acts of violence against civilians in Burundi.

"The Security Council expresses serious concern about the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Burundi. The Council calls on all Burundian parties to take practical steps to grant safe access to humanitarian personnel in their efforts to deliver assistance to vulnerable populations throughout Burundi."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2002/40.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.4676

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4676th meeting

Thursday, 19 December 2002, 4 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Yakimov
	Cameroon	Mr. Tidjani
	China	Mr. Chen Xu
	France	Mrs. D'Achon
	Guinea	Mr. Zoumanigui
	Ireland	Mr. Kavanagh
	Mauritius	Mrs. Huree-Agarwal
	Mexico	Mrs. Arce de Jeannet
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Gatilov
	Singapore	Mr. Yap
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Atieh
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harrison
	United States of America	Mr. Delgado

Agenda

Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

Report of the Security Council mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-74975 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Security Council resolutions 1160 (1998), 1199 (1998), 1203 (1998), 1239 (1999) and 1244 (1999)

Report of the Security Council mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (S/2002/1376)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Yugoslavia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahovic (Yugoslavia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them photocopies of the report of the Security Council Mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, from 13 to 17 December 2002. This report will be issued as Security Council document S/2002/1376.

The Security Council will now hear a briefing by His Excellency Mr. Ole Peter Kolby.

I give the floor to Mr. Kolby, Head of the Security Council Mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Kolby: It is an honour for me to introduce the report on the recent Security Council Mission to Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. At the invitation of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Kosovo, Michael Steiner, the Security Council decided to send a Mission there. I was asked, and I accepted, to head the Mission.

On 19 November, the Council decided that the visit should take place from 13 to 17 December, and a specific mandate was decided upon. Earlier Council Missions to Kosovo had taken place in April 2000 and in June 2001.

According to the mandate, the Mission had the following objectives: first, to find ways to enhance support for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and the work of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK).

To this end, the second objective was to observe UNMIK's operation and the situation on the ground and, specifically, to obtain an update on Special Representative of the Secretary-General Steiner's benchmarks, including the rule of law, the rate of sustainable return and the privatization agenda. In addition, it was to face the challenges faced by UNMIK, particularly the follow-up to the local elections, decentralization in Mitrovica and to report its conclusions to the Security Council.

Thirdly, the Mission's objective was to convey a strong message to the provisional institutions for self-government, local leaders, the newly elected municipal officials and all others concerned about the need to, first, use the opportunity created by the local elections to move forward with the decentralization process and to further develop democratic institutions; secondly, promote inter-ethnic reconciliation and inclusion; thirdly, reject all violence and condemn extremist and terrorist activities; fourthly, ensure public safety and order and promote stability and security; and, finally, support the full and effective implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and fully cooperate with UNMIK and the international security presence to these ends.

The Mission's fourth objective was to explore ways to enhance cooperation between UNMIK and the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, on the basis of the UNMIK-Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Common Document of 5 November 2001, and the opportunities for increased cooperation between Pristina and Belgrade.

The fifth objective of the Mission was to look at the impact of the regional situation on the work of UNMIK.

All Council members decided to be represented in the Mission.

As planned, the Mission was able to travel on 13 December, and during our four days in Kosovo and Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, we had an intensive programme, meeting with the representatives of the international community, Kosovo politicians, Yugoslav authorities and civil society groups in Pristina, Mitrovica and Belgrade.

As head of the Mission, I gave two press conferences, one in Pristina and one in Belgrade, and had to give a number of statements to the press after specific meetings.

In Pristina, on 14 and 15 December, the Mission met with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Michael Steiner, and his staff for briefings on the work of UNMIK and assessments of the situation.

We met with representatives of the provisional institutions of self-government, including President Ibrahim Rugova, Prime Minister Bajram Rexhepi, President of the Assembly Nexhat Daci and the Inter-Ministerial Coordinator for Returns, Milorad Todorovic.

We met with representatives of the Kosovo Assembly from all major Kosovo Albanian parties and the Kosovo Serb coalition, as well as representatives of other ethnic communities. Members of the Mission met with families of missing persons. On Sunday, 15 December, the Mission received a briefing from KFOR on the security situation and the main tasks and challenges of the international security presence.

The briefing was led by the KFOR Commander, Lieutenant General Fabi Mini. It then went to Mitrovica. In northern Mitrovica, the Mission was briefed on the Kosovo Trust Agency and the process towards privatization. We had a meeting with representatives of Serb and Bosnian civil society in northern Mitrovica. The Mission then walked across the bridge to southern Mitrovica to receive a briefing from the Special Representative, the Mitrovica regional administrator and the Mitrovica municipal administrator on the evolution of UNMIK's presence in northern Mitrovica and the status of implementation of UNMIK's Mitrovica strategy. This was followed by a meeting with the Presidents of the municipal assemblies in the Mitrovica region, three of whom are Kosovo Albanians and three Kosovo Serbs.

We visited the Kosovo Police Service (KPS) in Vucitrn, where we were briefed by the Director, Mr. Steven Bennet, and the Police Commissioner, Mr. Stefan Feller, as well as a high-ranking KPS officer, Colonel Ahmeti and where we met with a multi-ethnic group of KPS officers.

Back in Pristina, we had a meeting on return with leaders of returnees from Kosovo Albanian and Kosovo Serb communities, with the municipal assembly presidents of Gnjilane municipality, as well as with representatives of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and of various non-governmental organizations. In Pristina, we also had a meeting with deputies from various political parties from the Pristina municipal assembly. The day ended with a meeting with women representing different ethnic communities, members of the political establishment and civil society.

On Monday, 16 December, at the end of the visit, I held a joint conference with Special Representative Steiner before leaving for Belgrade. In Belgrade, we had separate meetings that day with the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Vojislav Kostunica, the Serbian Prime Minister, Goran Djinjic, the Serbian Deputy Prime Minister and the President of the Coordination Centre of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia for Kosovo and Metohija. Members of the Mission had a meeting with the representatives of the Serbian Association of Families of Missing Persons. On Tuesday, 17 September, the Mission met with the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, Goran Svilanovic. At the end of our visit, the Mission held a press conference.

Allow me, in this context, to express our appreciation to UNMIK and to Special Representative Steiner, as well as to the Security Council secretariat, for an excellent programme and for the impressive organization of the visit.

These are our findings on Kosovo. Since the last Mission of the Security Council to Kosovo, the Mission finds notable progress in several areas with regard to implementation of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999). Elections held for the Kosovo Assembly in 2001 and in municipalities in 2002 have led to the formation of the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government and the new municipal assemblies.

The process of handing over power and responsibilities to the local institutions continues.

There is also progress in the area of the rule of law. Crime rates are down, and security is improving. The Kosovo Police Service continues to increase in numbers, and the judiciary is in the process of being established, both of them as multi-ethnic bodies. For the first time, the number of minority returns is larger than that of those leaving. Nevertheless, the overall figures of internally displaced persons and refugees from minority communities returning remains low. The Mission noted a sharp contrast between the number of returnees and the number of those who still remained internally displaced, as well as the daunting task that lies ahead and the financial implications of that task. There is also progress in the preparations for the privatization process.

Cooperation between UNMIK and Belgrade has improved. The establishment of UNMIK administration in the northern part of Mitrovica has been necessary for the implementation of a uniform standard of administration throughout Kosovo and marks an important move against parallel institutions. The Mission believes that UNMIK's presence in the northern part of Mitrovica is an important step forward for the normalization of living conditions in the city. In that respect, the Mission is impressed by the work of UNMIK and KFOR. It also notes the interest in, and dedication to, this work by some members of the community in Kosovo.

The formulation of benchmarks for a realization of standards is a constructive approach for the further development of Kosovo towards a democratic, multi-ethnic society. The Mission looks forward to the next report on UNMIK, with a further detailing of the benchmarks, so as to measure progress. The Mission hopes that these can be worked out with local authorities in Kosovo in order to build local ownership of them. The Mission holds the view that "standards before status" is the only viable way forward.

The Mission was consistent in its message to all interlocutors regarding "standards before status", multi-ethnicity and integration of all communities, and their responsibility for the full implementation of resolution 1244 (1999). It urges the newly elected bodies to use their competencies, transferred in accordance with the Constitutional Framework, for the benefit of all inhabitants. The Mission stresses the importance of participation by all communities in the work of the elected bodies.

The Mission notes that, in spite of these positive developments, the situation in Kosovo remains fragile. Much work remains to be done, by both UNMIK and the Kosovo institutions and communities. This covers, inter alia, the rule of law, sustainable returns, local ownership of Kosovo's progress, democratic development, inter-ethnic reconciliation and dialogue, cooperation between Pristina and Belgrade and the combat against organized crime.

The firm establishment of the rule of law is central to achieving security, functioning democracy and sustainable economic development. Even though there has been notable progress in this area, the Mission finds that a continued strong effort is necessary to achieve the goals in this area.

The sustainable return of minorities is a precondition for a multi-ethnic society. A considerable amount of attention and resources should be dedicated to this issue. Even more than financial assistance, there is a need for region-wide and local commitment to supporting conditions for sustainable returns. Security, confidence-building and economic viability are all vital factors that must be addressed in order to achieve a significant, sustainable and successful return process. This is a responsibility for all levels of Kosovo society. UNMIK should, together with local institutions and civil society, continue to work, with a comprehensive approach, in order to move the return process forward.

Reconciliation and dialogue measures are paramount in this regard. One important contribution to reconciliation between the communities is the resolution of the fate of the missing persons from all communities. UNMIK is encouraged to press forward on these issues in consultation with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), KFOR, the Provisional Institutions and concerned local non-governmental organizations, and with Belgrade. UNMIK is requested to keep the Council regularly informed. The Council is urged to continue to follow the issue.

The Mission points out that the progress achieved so far has been driven to a large extent by the international community. The Mission has the firm impression that local ownership and commitment to these processes has been less than could have been expected. It is important that UNMIK make further

efforts to involve the local institutions and political leaders in the practical formulation and implementation of political goals and strategies. A case in point is the further specification and implementation of the benchmarks for the eight standards articulated in the "standards before status" policy. A greater degree of local ownership of, and commitment to, the realization of those standards is a prerequisite for their ultimate successful implementation. Naturally, the communities themselves also have a critical responsibility in that regard.

The recently held municipal elections were conducted in a well-organized and non-violent fashion. Participation levels were on average disappointingly low, and especially so with regard to Kosovo Serbs. Greater effort must be made to promote participation in the political process in Kosovo. Effective participation by all communities in those institutions is a prerequisite for a functioning democracy in Kosovo. Special emphasis is given to the inclusion of, and respect for, the views and interests of all communities by the local institutions. The Mission stresses a results-oriented approach through consensus.

The Mission underscores the necessity that elected representatives act in a responsible and solution-oriented manner in order to provide basic services for the inhabitants of their municipalities. The Mission emphasizes that the handing over of responsibilities from UNMIK administrators to the locally elected bodies needs to be done in a way that ensures local ownership and accountability. There are huge tasks for the municipal assemblies to address. Municipalities have a particular responsibility to foster dialogue, reconciliation and conditions for sustainable return, and to act against corruption. UNMIK should support efforts in that regard.

The Mission urges UNMIK, in consultation with local institutions and elected representatives, to further elaborate the proposal for the decentralization of competences to municipalities without delay.

It is the opinion of the Mission that the time has come for cooperation between Pristina and Belgrade on practical issues. UNMIK should consider ways and means of facilitating such contacts and practical cooperation. The Provisional Institutions of Self-Government should similarly take steps within their competences to make that possible.

The Mission underscores the importance of viewing developments in Kosovo in a regional perspective. Events in Kosovo have an impact on the surrounding region and vice versa. That is linked not only to political issues, but also to security, law and order and economic development. The Mission points to the need for regional cooperation in order, for example, to effectively combat organized crime, including trafficking.

In the light of the many difficult issues yet to be resolved, the Mission is of the view that continued substantial international engagement in Kosovo will be necessary for the foreseeable future.

The Mission would like to express its appreciation to Special Representative Michael Steiner and the staff of UNMIK for their efforts to realize the decision of the Security Council. The Mission likewise expresses its gratitude to General Fabio Mini and KFOR. The implementation of resolution 1244 (1999) remains high on the Security Council's agenda, and the Mission is impressed by the hard-working dedication of the men and women, local and international, of UNMIK, working together with local and international partners, to implement that resolution.

Those are the findings of the Mission.

Finally, let me thank my fellow Council members for their constructive participation in the Mission.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Council, I should like to express gratitude and appreciation to all the members of the Mission, which was so ably led by Ambassador Kolby, for the manner in which they discharged their important responsibility on the Council's behalf.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4677

Security Council

Fifty-seventh year

Provisional

4677th meeting

Friday, 20 December 2002, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Valdivieso	(Colombia)
Members:	Bulgaria	Mr. Raytchev
	Cameroon	Mr. Chungong Ayafor
	China	Mr. Wang Yingfan
	France	Mr. de la Sablière
	Guinea	Mr. Boubacar Diallo
	Ireland	Mr. Corr
	Mauritius	Mr. Koonjul
	Mexico	Mr. Aguilar Zinser
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Konuzin
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Mekdad
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Negroponte

Agenda

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month

Letter dated 19 December 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1387)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

02-75183 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council for the current month

Letter dated 19 December 2002 from the Permanent Representative of Colombia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2002/1387)

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

In this meeting, we shall hear statements from the five outgoing members, to be followed by statements from the remaining members.

Mr. Koonjul (Mauritius): First of all, let me thank you, Mr. President, for convening this wrap-up meeting and for giving us, the departing members of the Security Council, the opportunity to share our views on the work of the Council over the past 12 months. This exercise will certainly be beneficial for the Council's future work as well as for the new members who will be joining the Council next year.

I should also like to congratulate you, Mr. President, and your delegation on the manner in which the business of the Council is being conducted this month. There is no doubt that it has been a very busy month, but we are happy to note that you have striven very hard to maintain your initial plan to end the Council's normal business today. I should also like to thank your deputy, Ambassador Franco, for the daily annotated programme that he has been sending to our Missions. That has helped us enormously in preparing for Council consultations and public meetings in a better way, with the result that the work of the Council has become more effective. It would be a good thing if that practice could be maintained in the future.

In addition, my delegation is very grateful to you, Mr. President, for having prepared and circulated a non-paper to serve as a general guide for today's meeting. In it you have asked us to assess the main contributions, political relevance, difficulties and dilemmas of the Security Council, using examples of the work accomplished during the year 2002, and to identify similar problems for the Council for 2003. I will try to follow your guidelines and will focus on a number of issues that, I believe, have been and will remain very significant for the Council.

Throughout the year, the Security Council has striven very hard to maintain international peace and security. Its commitment and perseverance have resulted in many success stories, such as an independent Timor-Leste and a stabilized and more peaceful Sierra Leone, Angola and Kosovo — to name only a few — as well as the remarkable Council action in Afghanistan. Those success stories can provide very useful lessons to the Council as it deals with other conflict situations and further complex issues.

During the course of the year, the Security Council has also made significant progress in its working methods, particularly in the area of increased transparency and interaction with the wider United Nations membership. The increase in the number of public meetings and of public briefings preceding consultations on certain issues has been highly appreciated by the general membership and has helped to break the divide between the Council and other United Nations Members. The Council should continue to give the general membership the opportunity to express their views and proposals on issues of which Council is seized. In our view, that approach remains the most effective way to obtain the greatest support of the international community for any Security Council action, as evidenced by the overwhelming response that resolution 1373 (2001) obtained through the methodology adopted by Ambassador Sir Jeremy Greenstock. Maintaining that approach, which in turn will strengthen the centrality of the Council, will be a major challenge for the Council in the years to come.

Closely linked to that is the need for the Council to be perceived as a credible and even-handed body that looks at all issues with the same objective, impartial and constructive approach. No distinction should be made, in our view, in the manner in which any particular subject is treated as opposed to another, nor should there be any distinction between one group of members and another within the Security Council. Any such divide would be harmful to the Council's long-term relationship with the rest of the international community. Council unity should remain the constant objective of every member, since we all know that the Council is most effective when it acts in unison. Consensus-building on the basis of collective interest,

rather than divisions along the lines of national interests, needs to be emphasized.

One of the major challenges for the Council in the future will be the effective implementation of its decisions and resolutions. Dozens of resolutions remain unimplemented, some of them because of defiance by members and others because they are simply impractical. Several decisions concerning appeals and urgent calls — for example, on rebel movements in Africa or even for the disarmament of Kisangani — have not been complied with. It will be necessary for the Council to address that important issue to ensure its own credibility.

As the Council discusses situations in areas affected by conflict, we rely mostly on reports of the Secretary-General and on briefings by the Secretariat or by Special Representatives of the Secretary-General, which undoubtedly are both comprehensive and extremely useful. However, our experience has shown that, no matter how comprehensive such reports or briefings are, there is much vital information that we fail to obtain. That is why we feel that it is extremely important for Council members to undertake regular field visits to familiarize themselves with the situation on the ground by interacting with the actors and the local communities. Such visits also help to create greater awareness among Council members of the real needs and expectations of people at the grass-roots level, thereby allowing for discussion beyond the purely academic level. We have found all the field missions in which we have participated to be extremely useful, enlightening and, in many ways, very effective in terms of the message that the Council sends to the parties.

We feel that the Council should consider splitting visiting missions into two or even three groups, as in that way it would be possible for such a mission to visit more places and to meet with more people in a particular country. As the Council discusses the whole question of field missions, it may wish to consider such a proposal.

With the success of the peace processes in several conflict situations in Africa, namely Sierra Leone, Angola, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the challenge that we will face will be the consolidation of peace in those countries. The Council must work towards that objective to ensure that those countries reach a stage where peace becomes irreversible. The signing of peace agreements is a crucial stage in any process. That is the time when the prompt support of the international community is most important. It is an opportunity which we cannot miss, even though sometimes we tend to become complacent and start focusing attention elsewhere. Our experience in Guinea-Bissau and in the Central African Republic should remind the Council of the importance of peace consolidation; in this context, we feel that it will have to work in close cooperation with all United Nations agencies for peace to be permanently anchored.

A full, comprehensive and effective programme of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) represents another challenge that the Council will have to address next year and in the years to come. Ways and means will have to be found to deal with those not willing to undergo voluntary DDR. My delegation has always supported the voluntary basis for undertaking DDR, but at the same time we have always stressed the need to have contingency plans in respect of those who continue to undermine peace. Incomplete DDR is a source for future instability.

In the same vein, we feel that the demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration of ex-combatants should be taken at a regional or even continental level, especially in the case of Africa, where there is such mobility and such "demand" for combatants. We hope the Council will give serious consideration to this issue.

The Council has been quite effective with conflicts that are already full-blown. On several occasions, especially during brainstorming sessions, we have discussed the need for the Council to focus attention on preventive measures that can be more effective and more economical. At the beginning of this year, the Council very timidly addressed the crisis which Madagascar was experiencing at that time. Currently we have been doing the same with the crisis in Côte d'Ivoire. The Council is often reluctant, lest it be accused of interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, to address what we would consider to be a clear pre-conflict situation.

While we fully understand the limitations, we believe there is a need for the Council to see how it can best intervene in situations where conflicts may be averted, before they escalate to uncontrollable scale. In this regard, we feel that the Council should work closely with regional and subregional organizations and

should fully utilize their early warning systems. Closer cooperation with the African Union in the preventive field is absolutely vital. The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and its Peer Review Mechanism provide the necessary framework to avert crisis situations, and the Security Council could work in helping to strengthen the institutional capacity of the African Union and in implementing NEPAD.

Mauritius will be completing its two-year term in the Council at the end of this month. Our membership has been an extremely enriching and challenging experience for us, especially in view of our size, resources and influence. But it is that very specificity which has led us to take a stand based on principles, objectivity, impartiality, sense of justice, even-handedness, fair play and, above all, consensus-building to preserve and strengthen the unity of the Council.

As one of the representatives of Africa, we have tried to focus the Council's attention on African issues and to bring a new perspective in dealing with some of the burning questions afflicting our continent. While advocating a global and comprehensive approach to problems in Africa, we have highlighted the specificities of each situation, which has to be viewed on its own merits. We are pleased with the establishment of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, just as much as with the beginning of a new phase of cooperation between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council. It is our sincere hope that the Council will continue to further strengthen such cooperation in the future. As we look back on our performance, we have a feeling of great humility, as well as some pride that our modest contribution may have helped consolidate peace and international security in the world.

I would like, in conclusion, to express my Government's sincere thanks and gratitude to all members of the Council, whose assistance and support have been of immense value to us. I wish to equally thank the whole Secretariat team for their support, especially during the Mauritian presidency. Last but not least, I want to thank my own team, both those who are sitting behind me and those who work behind the scenes, for their dedication and hard work.

I would like to end my intervention by reading out a quote from former President Clinton of the United States, who has said that:

> "We have no choice but to learn to live together, to choose cooperation over conflict, to give expression to our common humanity by following simple rules: everyone deserves a chance; everyone has a role to play; we all do better when we work together; we are not as different as we think".

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of Mauritius for the kind words he addressed to me and to my delegation.

Mr. Corr (Ireland): May I thank you, Mr. President, for convening this wrap-up discussion on the work of the Security Council over the past year. We find this a very valuable exercise, and today it especially offers departing members of the Council a chance to give our views and assessment on the work of the Council.

I would also like to thank you, Mr. President, for the work of the Colombian presidency over the past month, and everyone in your delegation for a month of real achievement, commitment and effectiveness in the work of the Council.

There is a phrase of T.S. Eliot — "liberation from the future as well as the past" — that seems to me in many ways, perhaps with undue scepticism, to sum up the work of the Security Council. The Council stands at the very centre of the multilateral and international system, supporting cooperation by nations, anticipating and averting threats to peace, but also building peace, and enforcing peace where that is called for, conscious always of risks, whatever their shape — but, as is the duty of the Council, conscious also of hopes. This is as it should be. Internationalism is about action, not just ideals.

To serve in the Security Council, therefore, is a great honour for any country. The Council is the property of all United Nations Member States. It is the property of the world, not of its members, permanent or elected, and not of any combination of them.

What are the standards the Council must meet? How do we meet these tests, how effectively does the Council operate? Where do we stand, looking back and looking forward? Those are issues I want to address in my remarks today.

On how the Council performs its work, it seems to me there are four central tests that must be met. The Council is about, above all else, the safeguarding of international peace and security. This is the place that intersects with power and the views of capitals, some that are powerful, some less so. But collective security is about power and about the willingness to use power for the wider good if necessary.

If the Security Council is just a talking shop, its role has ended. There is always a balance there between multilateralism and the individual role of States, between national interests and the global public good. This tension meets often in this Chamber. But the Security Council is also about law. In a world where bipolar deterrence or balanced equilibrium are gone and where market forces shape much of the world in a rather Darwinian fashion at times, this is a place that says, on behalf of the international community, "It is so, let it be done". Even though the Council is intensely political, it needs to always value this special and austere role in international law.

The Security Council must also value its legitimacy; this is a political test. People around the world, as we have seen in recent months, look to the Council as a test of the legitimacy of major actions affecting international peace and security. Therefore, a sense of honour and fairness needs to be embedded in our work. We must honour our decisions when taken and our word when given. We must also honour the expectations that the international community has in us. And we must show fairness. We should not have double standards on decisions we take. It is surely wrong if war can flow from some decisions of the Council while only shrugs and indifference flow from others.

The Security Council must also be about partnership. The Council cannot do everything and yet specific decisions and issues have implications often involving the economic and social as well as the political dimensions. We need to see the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council as partners and they need to view the Security Council as a partner. We need stronger partnership throughout the intergovernmental system in the United Nations. Too much light in the United Nations, perhaps, shines on this Chamber, and too little elsewhere.

How have we done in the light of these tests? In the main, in the view of my delegation, we have done well. In Africa, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo is at work. Support has been given to the Burundi peace process. Peace has been broadly achieved in Sierra Leone and Angola. Regional instability in many parts of Africa still remains a problem. The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan is at work in the service of the people of Afghanistan.

Each month the Council looks at many issues on its agenda. We take decisions, rightly, when we view the time is right. That is the way it should be. But in an increasingly untidy world, where events create enormous pressure, we must stand further back from time to time and look at the wider canvas and the wider forces at work.

In Africa, as Ambassador Koonjul has just said, new and important forces are at work: the African Union, the New Partnership for Africa's Development, regional cooperation and an increasing sense of African ownership of African issues. We need to support all of this in the work of the Council, including in relation to specific decisions on the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi, the Great Lakes region, Somalia and the Central African Republic. We need to remember that collective security and international peace and security are concepts. Our decisions on issues operationally are part of a wider matrix. Terrorism in a failed State can be terrorism anywhere in the world. Profound alienation, bitterness and failure to respect human rights do not end at borders.

Specifically, we need more strategic focus on the situation in the Middle East. It is a profound and growing threat to international peace and security. The situation in the occupied Palestinian territories is intolerable and unacceptable. That this situation still prevails is an affront to the international community and reveals our lack of political will in a place of deadly danger and injustice.

We also need more strategic focus on conceptual and thematic issues. There is deep and unacceptable poverty in Africa. There is alienation among many in the Arab world. There is alienation in many parts of the world because of exclusion from the benefits of globalization.

We also need more strategic focus on conflict prevention and on peace-building when conflict is over. We need the capacity to think boldly, and not just on disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR).

But there are operational implications, such as how effectively DDR operates in the Great Lakes and so forth.

How do we operate? On our working methods, it has been the view of my delegation, and I repeat today, that there is too much on our agenda. There is too much of "this issue, this morning, this month". We need a more focused approach, perhaps involving setting aside one or two days a month to look at issues that have to appear on our agenda, but in such a way as to deal with them speedily and effectively instead of devoting a full morning to each of them.

We need more committees of the Council. The Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa and the sanctions Committees are examples of how effectively committees can operate. We need committees that could filter and look at in more depth the issues on the Council agenda.

We need more structured dialogue with the Secretary-General and with the Secretariat. Apart from the very valuable monthly lunch, perhaps the Secretary-General could set aside part of the day once a month for a background look at issues on the Council's agenda and at the canvas against which we must consider them.

The relationship between the permanent five and the elected 10 has been an issue of some contention over the past months and years. In my view, there has been a growing and welcome level of cooperation among the elected 10. This is the way it should be. In terms of the permanent five, my delegation has never seen any plots or conspiracy. These are the members of the Council which are permanent; they have a veto. That is the world we live in, and the Security Council reflects this.

But perception can be as important as reality. We need to address perceptions. Those perceptions can include, and at times have included, a sense that the permanent five may not always show the sensitivity to the elected 10 that is required. This is a matter of perception, not necessarily substance, but we do think it needs to be addressed in the period ahead. One way of doing this might be a monthly meeting involving all Council members away from the United Nations building, where we would look at issues in a free and flexible way.

Finally, where do we stand? In the view of my delegation, the Security Council works well. It could work better. It has come a long way in becoming more open and more transparent. It should focus more on main items on its agenda rather than necessarily dealing with all items on its agenda in a routine way. It needs to strengthen its partnership with other United Nations bodies and they need to strengthen their partnership with the Security Council. Here I am thinking of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights, for example.

Ireland finishes our Security Council with a strong sense of pride at having served. We are proud too that we have tried to highlight issues we think matter: Africa, the Middle East, human rights and conflict prevention. We leave with great admiration for all the other members of the Council and for their work in the service of peace. We leave also with a deep sense of admiration and respect for the Secretary-General, for his commitment, his integrity and his willingness to show leadership at all times. We have appreciated that very much.

In conclusion, it is right to express our appreciation to everyone from the Secretariat involved in the work of the Council, but also to the Secretariat generally for the work that is done for the people of the world with great idealism and effectiveness. This work is often not appreciated around the world as it should be.

This is a place that matters. It is, therefore, to be guarded and cherished. That was the approach we tried to bring to our period on the Security Council, and it is the strong conviction that we have as we end it.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of Ireland for the kind words he addressed to me and to my delegation.

Mr. Mahbubani (Singapore): Ten minutes to summarize two years: that is quite a challenge. I may have to piggyback to save time and say that I completely endorse what Ambassador Koonjul and Ambassador Corr have said about the wonderful work done by the Colombian presidency — by you and your team, Sir. I also endorse what they have said about the usefulness of this wrap-up session, because, frankly, if we did not have this wrap-up session we would be leaving the Council without having an opportunity to leave behind our impressions of what we have done.

We thank you very much for this, Mr. President. We also want to emphasize the point that was made both by Ambassador Koonjul and Ambassador Corr, that the Council's record over the past two years has been a successful one. Indeed, my list of success stories is the same as the ones they pointed to, so I will not list mine here.

I want to emphasize a point. We thought the most useful contribution we can make in this meeting is to suggest areas for improvement in future years. We believe, to quote an old cliché, that an organization languishes if it only has unloving critics or uncritical lovers, and I hope we will be seen as a loving critic of the Council.

We believe that all good organizations should have the three C's: a culture of action, a culture of innovation and a culture of reflection. Clearly in the Council, as demonstrated in the remarks made by Ambassador Corr, we have a strong culture of action. We deliver results. Whenever a crisis occurs the Council responds.

But frankly it is an organization that is weak in the cultures of innovation or reflection. This is what we will speak about. To bring about change requires leadership from the owners of the Council. One thing which has puzzled me is a question I raised at the Security Council retreat. Who are the owners of this Council? Is it the 15 Member States? Is it the five permanent members? Is it the 191 Member States, or is it, as stated in the Charter, "we the peoples" of the world? We cannot fully address this subject, but I hope it will form the subtext of what I speak of today.

The contribution we would like to make today is to suggest five concrete areas where we believe further improvements can be made in the work of the Council. The first area is to try to undertake a sharpened strategic overview of the work of the Council. As we all know, the Security Council has become the busiest organ within the United Nations family. It meets daily and has grown in size and complexity. Each time the 15 members meet we discuss individual slices of the Council's work, whether it is the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Middle East or Burundi. But we never step back and look at the whole picture of what the Council is doing.

If you look at the whole picture, it is amazing how much the load and complexity of the work of the Council has grown in the last 10 years. For example, in any single day we can examine conflict situations across the globe from Asia to Africa. We can also move from assessing political considerations on how to encourage parties to abide by peace processes, to deliberating military recommendations on the size, shape and area of the deployment of peacekeeping operations. We can move from responding to a humanitarian crisis to monitoring financial embargos imposed by the United Nations Security Council. We can consider juridical questions relating to the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), to examining the legitimacy and adequacy of Members States in combating international terrorism. This is a huge agenda that has grown in the Council.

Each time we meet, we discuss each slice and we never sit back and reflect on the Council as a whole and on how it is performing as an institution. One complete suggestion we would make — and this probably builds on what both Ambassador Koonjul and Ambassador Corr have said — is that we should find time to sit back and reflect on the overall work of the Council. We tried to do this during the annual retreat of the Security Council with the Secretary-General. But often there is no follow-up to the retreats.

Under your presidency, Sir, we had a very useful meeting on 11 December 2002, and I commend you for the record you have given us, because this demonstrates the value of such reflective sessions. Of course we can have more of such wrap-up sessions.

We should also build on the 15-plus-15 format that Ambassador Jeremy Greenstock started in his luncheon meetings, but all in all I think we need to do more in terms of reflecting on the overall work of the Council. We believe that is the way we can introduce the culture of reflection.

The second area where we can benefit from innovation and reflection is in the area of peacekeeping operations. Clearly, peacekeeping operations have become one of the most important instruments of the Security Council for maintaining international peace and security. The amount of money that the Security Council authorizes to spend on peacekeeping — $3 billion annually — is much larger than the United Nations regular budget. But in the two years we have been on the Council, there has never been even one

discussion on how we go about allocating these $3 billion.

Recently there was a book launch ceremony where Professor Stephen Stedman of Stanford University, speaking of his book "Ending Civil Wars", calculated how much the United Nations spends in each peacekeeping operation per victim involved in the conflict. You get a remarkable disparity where you can spend up to a few thousand dollars per victim in the Balkans to a few dollars per victim in Rwanda. This disparity needs to be addressed because at some point, people will be asking questions as to why there is such a large gap in how you allocate your resources.

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) has improved over the years to deal with the evolution of peacekeeping operations from purely traditional operations to complex multi-faceted missions. Our view is that the Security Council needs to catch up with the DPKO and move from purely mechanical discussions on peacekeeping operations, to more reflective discussions. We can, for example, make better use of the Best Practices Unit of the DPKO, to draw lessons of successful and unsuccessful peacekeeping operations and apply them to current and future operations. A concrete suggestion we can make here is that in our existing Working Group on peacekeeping operations we hope there will be more reflection on how decisions are made concerning peacekeeping operations.

A third idea which could benefit from innovation and reflection is, of course, the area of sanctions. We know sanctions are another key instrument of the Security Council and we have shared some of the experiences that all of us, as chairmen of the Sanctions Committees, had in the meeting you organized, Sir, on Wednesday 18 December 2002. But we do believe more reflection is needed in this area. As the Secretary-General once noted, "sanctions have had the paradoxical effect of sometimes strengthening the regime and punishing the people". And as a consequence, many questions have been raised about sanctions regimes. For example, there was an article in *Harpers* magazine in November 2002 that we should look at. Again, more reflection is needed in this area. I hope the Working Group on sanctions chaired by Ambassador Martin Belinga-Eboutou will be able to do more work in this area.

To give one example of how improvements can be made, when we chaired the Liberian Sanctions Committee, and we put up a travel banned list, we had no personal details such as passport number for some of the names on the travel banned list. Then we discovered that another Sanctions Committee actually had the details. But because each of the Sanctions Committees works in locked boxes, there is no transfer of knowledge from one to another. Clearly this is something that can be improved upon, and something the Working Group on sanctions can look at.

The fourth area which could benefit from innovation and reflection — and I guess you will not be surprised I mention this — is the area of working methods and procedures of the Council. Here let us stress that there have been improvements; more open meetings have been held. Recent innovations include the Mexican format begun in February 2002, of having open briefings followed by informal consultations.

Clearly there is room for improvement. To cite an obvious example, as we know, the Security Council creates the most far-reaching international law, but surprisingly, it does not want to be bound by rules itself, except by a set of rules and procedures which we know still remain provisional after almost 60 years. At some point someone will ask the question: When will your provisional rules stop being provisional? There are also other areas where we need to improve working methods.

One of the things I vividly remember about working in the Council is in some ways the mechanization of the work process. Each day when we come to work, we go to the informal consultations room, we hear a briefing, sometimes with slides, sometimes without slides, sometimes we have fact sheets, sometimes we do not have fact sheets. We go through a mechanical routine of addressing each issue almost in a set formula. But often we do not stand back and ask, at the end of the day, how much value did we add in that discussion, or did we just go through a discussion for the sake of having a discussion? That is why we think, frankly, that there is good reason to activate and make more useful the Working Group on Documentation and Procedures. We are aware — speaking candidly — that there is some resistance to the idea of making this Working Group more active. We are aware that there is resistance, but we want to suggest to those who, in a sense, resist change that it actually may be in the interests of all 15 members to

have better working methods and procedures, because in that way we will learn to use our time better.

I would like to make one simple suggestion: the best way to have change is to provide leadership to that Working Group. If we could agree, for example, to have a permanent annual Chairman of the Working Group on Documentation and Procedures — that has been suggested by Ambassador Martin Belinga-Eboutou of Cameroon — I believe that we would be making a huge leap forward in that area.

Finally, I would like to refer to the most difficult issue. Indeed, I raise it with some trepidation, because I am not sure whether easy answers can be found in this area. But clearly it has to be addressed. It is, of course, the area of the accountability of the Security Council. Frankly, I do not see any answers being supplied to this question, even within the next 10 years. But I hope to plant a small seed which will grow into a tree some day.

We all know that all organizations are accountable in one way or another. Governments are accountable to their electorate. Corporations are accountable to their shareholders. The United Nations Secretariat is accountable to the United Nations Member States, who own the Secretariat. What is unclear is who the Security Council is accountable to, and what it is accountable for. There are no easy answers to that. Some have cited Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which states that the Security Council acts on behalf of the Member States, and say that the Council is accountable to the general membership of the United Nations. But the well-known book by Bruno Simma — *The Charter of the United Nations: A Commentary* — notes that the Security Council "is not subordinate to the Assembly", as the Assembly has not been granted the power to hold the Council responsible for failing to present a report in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 3, of the Charter or for presenting a deficient report, or even for any actions by the Council listed in a report.

Clearly, there are no easy answers. But even though the Security Council may not be formally or legally accountable to United Nations Member States, it is also clear that the Council does in some ways provide a service. It provides a service to the international community that is in some ways similar to the job done by the fire department — that is the most common analogy used. Fire departments traditionally react whenever a fire breaks out anywhere, at any time. But as we know — indeed, Ambassador Corr mentioned this — the Security Council has been more selective in its responses. Such selectivity can in the long run damage its credibility, and that is something that we need to address if we are trying to improve the Council.

We also believe that it is important for the Council to understand where it derives its legitimacy from. It does not derive its legitimacy on its own. Indeed, if we took the 15 Member States out of the United Nations complex and created an independent global security council with the same members, it would not have the legitimacy that we have sitting here. It is the United Nations fabric that provides legitimacy to the Council — the United Nations Charter, the regular elections by the 191 Member States of the 10 elected States members of the Council and, indeed, the general recognition that the Security Council is part of the United Nations family. But that relationship with the United Nations family must be a two-way street. The Council cannot just claim its legitimacy from the United Nations family without giving something back in return. And what it needs to give back is a sense that it is accountable to the United Nations family for its actions. Let me stress here that, given the Council's recent success stories, it has a very proud and positive record, and for that reason we should welcome the idea of accountability, rather than shy away from it.

In conclusion, I would like to join my colleagues from Mauritius and Ireland in thanking the States Members of the United Nations for having given us the opportunity to serve on the Council. We hope that we have not let down those who elected us.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): Let me at the outset stress that I appreciate your initiative, Mr. President, to provide the members of the Council with an opportunity to briefly reflect on the year that is almost over and to consider what lessons have been learned that might be useful for the year ahead. This opportunity is particularly appreciated by my delegation, which — along with those of our colleagues from Ireland, Mauritius, Singapore and your own country, Colombia — is leaving the Council. The permanent five members of the Council can draw on their extensive institutional memory, but the elected members have to start almost anew every time they serve on this body. Norway last served on the Security

Council in 1979 and 1980, and both the world and the Council were very different in those days.

Our first lesson learned is thus the need for new elected members to be assisted in every way possible by other members of the Council. Elected members should therefore do their utmost to give their successors a flying start by sharing their experiences, not only on the substantive issues before the Council but also on procedural questions and on the working methods of the Council.

Another lesson learned is the importance of unity in the Council. It is when we are able to speak with one voice that the impact of our decisions is greatest. This has been demonstrated on several occasions during the past year. Unity is particularly important with regard to one of the most difficult issues before the Council — the situation in the Middle East. Decisions made by the Council in 2002 might not have had an immediate impact on the situation on the ground in that very troubled part of the world. However, the Council has been able to express views that will be important when the parties are again able to sit down and negotiate a peace agreement that will benefit the peoples on all sides. The fact that the Council has expressed a vision for a Palestinian State is important. We should continue to strive for unity in our deliberations on the Middle East. The Council will have an opportunity to do so again this afternoon and, I am certain, on several occasions in the coming year.

A third lesson learned is the need for Council members to assume a special responsibility for certain issues. The Council's workload has now become so great that we all depend on the expertise not only of the excellent United Nations Secretariat but also of other members to provide information and insight that will be useful to us all. Norway has tried to carry its share of this responsibility by trying to coordinate the Council's work on the Horn of Africa. In Ethiopia and Eritrea the Council has been instrumental in helping the parties to move towards sustainable peace, but there is still a lot of work to be done to complete the peace process and reconcile the two countries. The Council's continued engagement is needed to ensure implementation of the Border Commission's decision, and the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea still plays a crucial role in maintaining peace along the border.

In Somalia, the Council has tried to support the peace process, led by the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development, and to focus on attempts to limit the flow of arms to the country. However, even if the warring parties agree to a peace agreement in Eldoret, there is a distinct need for continued and coordinated pressure and assistance from the international community to ensure stability and security. We anticipate stronger coordination efforts concerning the Somalia conflict to be carried out within the United Nations framework, as well as in a regional context. The Council continues to have an important role to play in this connection, and we encourage it to act resolutely on forthcoming recommendations from United Nations experts monitoring the arms embargo.

A fourth and final lesson learned as we look to 2003 is the need to continue the work with so-called thematic issues and to make our deliberations on these issues as relevant as possible to the good work being done in peace operations around the world. Norway believes strongly in the importance of issues such as protection of civilians in armed conflict and children and armed conflict. Debates in the Council and reports by the Secretary-General on these and other issues are important in and of themselves. However, the impact is much greater if we follow up with concrete action. Norway did so in March of this year when it produced, in cooperation with the United Nations Secretariat and others, an aide-mémoire on the protection of civilians in armed conflict. We hope that in 2003 the Council will also approach thematic issues with the aim of translating words into concrete action.

Finally, the Norwegian delegation would like to express its gratitude to the other members of the Council for the cooperation they have extended to us. I would like also to thank the Secretariat, and I would like to like to express special thanks to my own staff for their dedication and hard work throughout our two years on the Council.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Colombia.

I should like to begin by expressing my gratitude to all of my colleagues for these two years during which we have tried to contribute, with enthusiasm and dedication, to the work of the Security Council. I should like also to thank in particular the members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States for

having placed their trust in Colombia throughout the period 2001-2002.

This is an opportunity for the members of the Council to reflect on the work that we have done in the past year. Having come to know well the colleagues who have already spoken and to appreciate their abilities, those of their teams and, of course, their dedication, and having shared with them their vision of the Council - which I would like to endorse after having heard their presentations - we would prefer on this occasion to reflect on one single theme: to suggest that the functions of the Council be adapted to the new challenges that are facing it in the fulfilment of its responsibilities.

We believe that in recent years the concept of international peace and security has undergone a fundamental transformation. Historically, the Council has dealt with threats stemming from inter-State or intra-State conflicts, as was the case during the cold war and the post-cold-war period, respectively. It is clear that the Security Council still defines many threats to international peace and security on the basis of these traditional international concepts.

Nevertheless, since the beginning of the new millennium, an additional and very important step has been taken in defining these threats, whose implications we still have not fully grasped. Indeed, we have included within this group of threats those of global scope which, because of their nature, are not limited to a specific territory or to the inhabitants thereof. This has been the most notable consequence that international terrorism has had for the concept of security that is now being increasingly shaped by Council decisions.

We can easily identify the cases in which this new approach has been applied, even though our actions sometimes give rise to doubts and involve a lack of definition; this is something that the Council must remedy if it wishes to be the ideal instrument for addressing these threats.

Within these new global threats, we have included the cases of 11 September and, more recently, the terrorist attacks in Bali, Indonesia; the hostage-taking in Moscow; and the attacks in Mombasa, Kenya, against Kenyan and Israeli citizens. In other words, the Council has gradually fallen into a case-by-case management of the global threats posed by terrorist acts, which could indicate its own inability to act. Which cases of terrorism should be characterized as threats to international peace and security, and which should not? Is this categorization useful? Are we not running the risk of become involved in very intensive political discussions in specific cases on which there is no consensus within the Security Council? Should such a divisive issue be brought before the Council?

Everything seems to indicate that the Security Council's ability to act in accordance with its definitions of threats to international peace and security is uneven. In inter-State conflicts, it has played, and continues to play, a constructive, effective and important role, as we saw recently with respect to the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia. In intra-State conflicts, it has also played, and can play, a constructive, effective and important role, as we saw recently in the case of Sierra Leone. Both cases involve a series of problems, many of them identified by the Secretariat and also by the members of the Council. But, in any case, a certain know-how exists that makes it possible to accumulate experience and produce results.

However, the Security Council has no experience in managing global threats, and, what is more worrisome, the little experience that it has acquired seems to highlight its worst shortcomings as an institution.

We feel that the Security Council should thoroughly and systematically discuss its own ability to perform its functions in the face of these global threats, with at least the same intensity with which it discusses its reaction to threats to international peace and security that stem from inter-State or intra-State conflicts.

However, discussions are not enough. The Council must take strong and robust measures in order to enhance and fine-tune its ability to react. The cost of not doing would be to sacrifice the validity of multilateralism as an instrument for responding to international terrorism and to weaken the image of the Council in the eyes of the peoples of the world, who would see their own personal security jeopardized.

With respect to this item, we would like to stress the urgency of revising the mandate set out in resolution 1373 (2001), strengthening the universality of resolution 1390 (2002), and exploring options to create new instruments that would improve the Council's capacity to respond.

In the light of global threats that are not confined to a specific territory — as have been the ones that the Council is accustomed to considering — the United Nations must be more innovative, more sophisticated and more professional.

The Secretariat, which largely coordinates the implementation of Council decisions, must overcome its shortcomings and help to work effective to combat these new global threats to international peace and security. This Organization must not be afraid to call terrorism by its name. Leadership and ability must come from New York, because the point of reference must be here.

I should like to conclude with what is, perhaps, a basic thought on the future of the Security Council. We are ending our tenure as non-permanent members with the absolute conviction that this body is crucial for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is precisely this characteristic that require that we produce results.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

Mr. Boubacar Diallo (Guinea) (*spoke in French*): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to convey the gratitude of our delegation for the initiative that you have taken in convening this end-of-year wrap-up meeting for the Security Council. It gives us yet another opportunity to engage in a wide-ranging exchange of views on our activities and to assess the progress that has been made with respect to the objectives set. This exercise should allow us to identify the obstacles that are strewn along our path, so that we can take the necessary corrective action and thereby enhance the effectiveness of our future actions.

Before getting into the heart of the matter, I would like to say how much my delegation appreciates the skill, talent and effectiveness with which you guided the Council's proceedings in December.

There is not a shadow of doubt that the year just ending has been full of challenges for our Council, challenges that we were determined to tackle in unity in order to preserve international peace and security. We have had to deal with a number of questions; some of them proved to be more complex than others. In this vein, we had tremendous success in eliminating certain trouble spots, in Angola, Sierra Leone, Timor-Leste and Eritrea/Ethiopia, for example. In all of these situations, the concerted will of the international community and the interested parties ultimately enabled us to agree to a common cooperating framework to help improve our diagnostic work and find the appropriate cure.

Even with our successes, we must not forget that many conflicts still exist, particularly in the African continent. In this respect, we are duty-bound to continue our thinking in order to find a successful outcome for each case, which is our primary calling. To do this, a participatory approach, founded on international law and enjoying the support of all of the actors, both within the United Nations system and within regional and subregional organizations, is the best strategy and one that should be strengthened. This approach should obviously include a true internal, non-exclusive dialogue, a careful programme of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration and a vision extending to the entire region or subregion at issue.

The strategy just initiated by the Council along these lines to settle the Liberian problem is responding, in our view, to this approach and should be encouraged. We would like to make special mention of the Ad Hoc Working Group on conflict prevention and resolution in Africa, which through its initiatives and suggestions has enabled us to develop a framework that, if conscientiously used by the Security Council, will allow us to overcome the obstacles and find a solution to a number of delicate situations.

On another level, the sanctions Committees have contributed effectively, in their methodologies and their actions, to the recent implementation of an intelligent, targeted sanctions policy, and they have helped restore peace through pressure brought to bear on the different actors. The Groups of Experts, formed to survey the implementation of sanctions, also played no small role. In some cases, nevertheless, a great deal still needs to be done, and the experience of our success should inspire us. We have to look at how we follow up on integral implementation of sanctions.

Since 11 September 2001 the fight against international terrorism has become more essential than ever. In this respect, we commend the tremendous work done by the Counter-Terrorism Committee, whose work should be strengthened further and adapted to the different insidious forms of terrorism.

Peacekeeping operations, for their part, have been largely positive. They have allowed us to create an environment that is conducive to negotiation and dialogue, while restricting temptations and excesses and have led, in many cases, to a final peace being established. The United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) and the United Nations Mission of Observers in Prevlaka (UNMOP), which have just concluded their mandates, are eloquent examples of this. Nevertheless, there are still many other conflicts, where peacekeeping forces have been present for many years without a solution in sight. It is up to us, in these specific cases, to re-define our strategy by adapting it to on-the-ground realities, which presupposes, in our view, a better coordination between the troop-contributing countries and the effective implementation of the recommendations from the Brahimi Report.

During the year under review, our Council greatly improved its working methods and established greater transparency in its activities. We increased the number of our public meetings, which allowed Member States to communicate their views on the questions under consideration. We also initiated a number of other forms of communication that enabled us better to evaluate what we are doing. Also, the Council has taken greater interest in topical themes, some of which are perhaps not, some say, within its purview, even though they do help us better understand the nature of some conflict situations. An example of this would be the questions of food security and HIV/AIDS in conflict areas. It would seem to be a good idea to us to stress the importance of Security Council missions on the ground, which should be encouraged.

Another very important sphere has to do with the implementation of resolutions we adopt. What we see is not very encouraging, because there are a number of decisions not yet implemented. We must make an effort to avoid selectivity and change this state of affairs.

All of these ideas are for us a way of maintaining international peace and security. To reach this goal, we say once again that we must have more determination and greater will, and we must be guided in our daily actions by the idea that we can only succeed in unity, which is the foundation of our credibility.

Mr. Konuzin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The work of the Security Council in 2002 was highly intensive, particularly in December. There was a significant increase in the number of Council meetings, both formal and informal consultations. This year the Council adopted more than 100 resolutions and official Presidential Statements. We dispatched three Council Missions to Eritrea and Ethiopia, the Great Lakes region and Kosovo. We believe that the Security Council did an admirable job with an increased workload. The meetings were topical and thematic in nature and focused on achieving specific outcomes. A result of our joint work was the adoption of a whole range of important decisions on a number of sore points on the international agenda. Still, at the forefront of the Council's work in 2002 was the topic of the fight against international terrorism. A significant part of our work involved African issues as well. The Council paid quite a bit of attention to a Middle East settlement, to problems in Afghanistan and the situations regarding Iraq and the Balkans.

Today we are bidding farewell to five delegations who are concluding their work at the Council. We are grateful to them for the concerns they have articulated about the Council's work and for their wish to fine-tune this work. We share many of these concerns. On a number of them we do not have completely congruent positions, which is natural, since in addition to the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter that bring us together, we also have national interests. The important thing is that we are united in our wish to increase the effectiveness of the Council's work as the United Nations body that has the major responsibility for international peace and security.

In speaking about the contribution to the work of the Council of the departing delegations, I would like to note the following contributions. The tireless and painstaking work of our Irish colleagues in searching for mutually acceptable solutions and consideration of the most serious problems faced by the Council is deeply appreciated by all Security Council members. Ambassador Richard Ryan and the Irish delegation overall merit the highest praise for successfully guiding the Security Council Committee on sanctions against UNITA.

We take note of the active and thorough work done by the delegation of Mauritius, particularly on African issues. The discussions in Ambassador Jagdish Koonjul's Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, too, helped us focus on many problems on the African continent and helped us generate fresh, innovative ideas.

The effective and active work of the Norwegian delegation, headed by Ambassador Ole Peter Kolby, made a significant contribution to the successful work of the Council over the past two years. Concise and concrete Norwegian proposals on various problems before us helped us reach prompt consensus among members of the Security Council. The efforts of the Norwegian delegation and of Ambassador Kolby in heading the Council's sanctions Committee on Iraq deserve high marks.

I would like to note the valuable contribution made by the delegation of Singapore, and by Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani personally, in fine-tuning the working methods of the Security Council. Singapore's approach was highly organized and concrete. We will be able to make use of many of the ideas of our Singaporean colleagues in our future work.

The current presidency is further confirmation of the high degree of professionalism of our Colombian colleagues. The Colombian delegation's work in the Security Council was very professional and focused on finding solutions acceptable to all members, even when confronted with severe differences among Council members. We note and commend the high level of leadership provided by Ambassador Valdivieso and the entire Colombian delegation in the Security Council committee on sanctions against the Taliban.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all Security Council colleagues and to wish them a happy new year for 2003. To all Member States present here today and to our colleagues from the Secretariat, we convey our sincere best wishes for good health and success.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for his kind words to the outgoing members of the Council.

Mr. Negroponte (United States of America): In September, President Bush challenged the Security Council to live up to its mandate to address Iraq's non-compliance with its disarmament obligations. The Council was entrusted with finding a solution to meet that challenge. That ultimately resulted in the adoption of resolution 1441 (2002). During eight weeks of negotiation, the Council not only included the perspectives of its members but also provided the opportunity for all States to contribute to this extremely important and ongoing process. In so doing, the Security Council has reaffirmed its important role in dealing with Iraq's threat to international peace and security.

On African issues, the Council made outstanding contributions, many of which did not make the front pages of newspapers here in the United States, but which remain extremely relevant and important to vast numbers of people on this planet. For example, the Council's swift endorsement of the July Pretoria Agreement helped maintain the momentum behind the Agreement. Our decision to expand the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and authorize phase III operations signalled our support for the peace process.

Contributing to those decisions of the Council was the Council's innovative approach to developing information on those issues. For instance, in August, the Foreign Ministers of the signatories to the Pretoria Agreement met with the Council in a formal open meeting to reaffirm their support for the Agreement and to answer members' questions. The decision not to have Council members make statements in that forum kept the focus on the Foreign Ministers and gave the Council's eventual presidential statement greater political weight.

In Sierra Leone, the Council's work in urging the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone to play a role in the successful May elections was crucial. The Council needs to give the same amount of attention now to the Special Court for Sierra Leone, which is moving towards issuing its indictments in early 2003. The security, extradition and social issues that this will raise will require the Council's consideration. The Court, which is a unique institution, independent of the United Nations system but created by the United Nations and Sierra Leone at the Security Council's recommendation, will need the political support of the Council during the upcoming months. How we respond will determine the Court's eventual success.

On the Middle East, the Council made an important contribution in 2002 by providing an agreed endgame to this enduring conflict in resolution 1397 (2002), in which, for the first time, the Security Council affirmed a vision of two States, Israel and Palestine, living side by side within secure and recognized borders. That resolution was forward-looking and has now become enshrined in the pantheon of historic resolutions which form the basis upon which

peace will be negotiated. The Secretary-General and key partners in the international community are deeply involved, as members of the Quartet, in bringing the parties back to the negotiating table.

The challenge for the Council on the Middle East is now before us. We can remain on a constructive path that supports the efforts of the Quartet and others intricately involved in mediation in the Middle East, or we can return to the destructive practice of seeking to pass one-sided resolutions, heaping criticism on one party — that is to say, Israel. We completely disagree with an approach whereby draft resolutions seek to highlight the issue of occupation while neglecting Palestinian responsibility for eliminating terrorism. In 2002, the Council made several steps forward in acknowledging the obvious: suicide bombings destroy prospects for peace, as well as innocent lives. I would ask the question: will the Council have the courage in 2003 to take aim at those groups and their supporters that promote and perpetrate that violence and terror?

Finally, on counter-terrorism, I would like to call attention to the important work of the committee effectively chaired by you, Mr. President, in addressing the terrorist threat posed by Al Quaeda and also the continuing work of the groundbreaking Counter-Terrorism Committee chaired by my colleague Sir Jeremy Greenstock.

I would like to close with thanks to the Colombian presidency for creating an opportunity today for us to reflect, in perhaps the first quiet moment of the month, about the challenges and achievements over the past year and in the year ahead. Indeed, as five of our colleagues leave us, I salute the contributions that all have made during their presidencies, as well as during the entire period of their tenure.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of the United States for his comments addressed to outgoing members.

Mr. Wang Yingfan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the end of the year, five members of the Council will finish their term on the Council. It is very significant that you, Mr. President, have organized this wrap-up session, and we are very grateful to you for that.

I also wish to congratulate you on the outstanding manner in which you have presided over the work of the Council this month. Although the Council's working days were reduced in December due to the holidays, the relevant items of the programme of work scheduled at the beginning of the month were discussed in depth. Some of the very complicated and difficult questions were also appropriately addressed. The fact that the Security Council has been able to carry out its task in a transparent, efficient and fruitful way reflects your hard work and thoughtful planning, Mr. President, and that of the Colombian Mission. The President, in particular, gave detailed information to the members each day about the following day's work and the following stage of work, which was very useful in our preparation. I express my appreciation for that.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express our sincere thanks to the outgoing members — Colombia, Ireland, Mauritius, Norway and Singapore. In the past two years, they have actively participated in the consideration of various questions before the Council and have presided over the work of the Council's subsidiary organs in an outstanding manner. We will not forget their important contributions to the work of the Security Council.

Once again, I wish to welcome Angola, Chile, Germany, Pakistan and Spain to the Council. We believe that those countries will bring fresh vitality to the work of the Council. The Chinese delegation will cooperate closely with them.

Throughout the year that will soon end, the Council has considered a series of questions in a timely manner, which has included anti-terrorism, Iraq, the Middle East and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It has adopted more than 100 resolutions and presidential statements. When I say that, it does not mean that the more documents the Council can produce, the better. I merely want to emphasize that we have made substantive progress. For example, in the area of anti-terrorism, the Security Council and the Counter-Terrorism Committee have done an enormous job overall in cooperating and carrying out joint efforts to fight terrorism. We have laid a very solid foundation. That work has far-reaching impact.

Regarding the Iraqi issue, the Security Council has made fruitful efforts, and continues to do so, for the disclosure of information on the destruction of weapons of mass destruction in order to settle the question politically within the framework of the United Nations and to avoid war. Here too, therefore, we

believe that the work of the Security Council has been productive. It is worth mentioning that striving to achieve consensus through consultation has become a prominent characteristic of the work of the Council. We hope that that trend will be maintained.

African issues have accounted for almost half of the Council's agenda items. Some progress has been made this year on African hotspot issues and, in some cases, it has been groundbreaking and very significant. In the coming year, the Working Group on African issues and the Security Council can consider in greater depth and reflect on ways of strengthening coordination and cooperation with the African Union, African regional organizations and concerned African countries, so as to adopt effective measures to promote the early resolution of African issues and consolidate the progress achieved.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to wish the President and other members of the Security Council, including the general membership of the United Nations, a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year.

Mr. Chungong Ayafor (Cameroon) (*spoke in French*): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, for this excellent initiative that makes it possible for our outgoing members to produce a kind of last work based on a two-year experience at the heart of this unique world body that, through a resolution consisting of a few paragraphs, can decide on peace or war.

At a time when much attention is focused on the Security Council, this experience reveals more than ever its usefulness and importance. Cameroon will certainly be in a better position to participate more meaningfully in evaluating the Security Council in 12 months, when it, like all five departing members, will be free from the constraints and obligations of solidarity, even complicity, that binds people who belong to the same club.

This morning I would like to focus primarily on two or three concerns. The first has to do with the decision-making process within the Security Council, and in particular the role that elected members are expected to play in the Council. The presence of permanent members in an institution is in itself a decisive advantage. It implies an almost perfect mastery of issues, procedures, practices and even of what is not said. When that permanent membership is accompanied by a particularly favourable relationship of power, there is a tendency to take advantage of that position to advance one's views and interests, sometimes to the detriment of missions of general interest that led to the establishment of the institution in the first place.

Despite appearances, there is a pattern of behaviour that is shared by the members of the Council, who, willingly or not, are often tempted to believe that agreement between five is the same as agreement between 15. The Security Council would benefit from returning to its initial composition. It is composed of 15 members, but little by little, it is becoming a body of five plus 10 members. That dichotomy can only affect the transparency and the legitimacy to which we all aspire. The most tangible example is resolution 1441 (2002). It was adopted by the 15 members unanimously and responsibly. However, as soon as it was voted on, we returned, in the implementation, to our reflexes as a club of five, of 10, of 2, and so forth. That remark is meant less to criticize the Security Council than to alert it to a problem. During the open meeting on Iraq in October, the General Assembly got itself invited — there is no other way to describe it — to the Council to say, in particular, that missions to maintain international peace and security had been entrusted to the Council more for reasons of effectiveness and pragmatism than anything else. The Charter does not give anyone a blank check, because, in the long run, it is the body that includes all Members of the Organization and has full legitimacy. The obligation to be accountable must be maintained by all of the principal bodies of the United Nations. This should also remind us that it is the members elected by the General Assembly that give Security Council decisions their democratic legitimacy. In the absence of sound practice, the Council would risk losing its legitimacy and credibility.

The other concern that I should like to emphasize at this wrap-up meeting concerns the problem of sanctions that the Council imposes against certain States that violate the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. The Council is still searching for a global strategy for exiting sanctions regimes. It is also struggling to find effective ways of countering strategies aimed at bypassing sanctions that are used increasingly by organized crime networks. The growing criminalization of economies under sanctions also makes that difficult. The Council must,

therefore, find balanced formulas that avoid pushing the situation to the breaking point, because, once a conflict has erupted, it becomes increasingly difficult to return to normal economic and social life in the countries concerned.

That just balance, in our view, is also indispensable for the management of sanctions in a strict sense. Indeed, many examples show that sanctions generally have a more devastating impact on vulnerable populations — women, children and the poor — than on the regimes in place. Thus, we must do a better job of taking the humanitarian dimension into account when the Council makes decisions concerning sanctions. A formula that is beginning to bear fruit — and that we should certainly stress more — is the targeting of sanctions at very specific objectives. In any case, the sociological tailoring of such targeting should be discussed. The Council must have a substantive debate in the near future on the impact of sanctions on the populations and economies of third-party States whose only mistake is to be a neighbour of States that are at fault.

In conclusion, I should like to raise a subject that is important to my delegation and is particularly topical. In addressing situations of civil war or internal conflicts that pit democratically elected Governments against rebel movements or, more generally, against armed oppositions, the Council has — because of its passivity and a certain complacent condescension — sometimes left the impression of having surreptitiously legitimized certain rebel movements. That problem needs to be explored; it is a source of great concern to which the Council should find an ethical and adequate response.

Mr. Mekdad (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this wrap-up meeting to discuss the work of the Council. We have listened attentively, particularly to the statements of the representatives of delegations whose Council tenure will conclude at the end of this year. We reiterate our thanks to your delegation for presenting accurate daily information to Council members concerning our work programme, a practice that we believe should become permanent within the framework of improving the Council's working methods.

This meeting coincides with the end of the year, which allows us to review and assess our work, not only over the past month but throughout the year. Here, we should like to express our appreciation to the representatives of the five States that will leave the Council in a few days' time for their great contributions to its work, particularly in the area of developing its working methods and procedures and in carrying out its responsibilities through the adoption of many important and historic decisions. Because Syria still has a full year and a few days until the end of its tenure in the Council, we promise to present further comprehensive views with regard to the Council's performance at this time next year.

The importance of today's meeting is based on our deep conviction that we all must strive to improve the Council's performance and its working methods, so that its work can become more transparent and more effective, which in turn will enable it to address the challenges that are included on its agenda, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Here, we must add that respect for the Council's working methods and equal treatment of all its members are crucial in order to preserve the Council's unity and credibility. We would have liked to have had the compulsory procedures and working methods of the Council followed in dealing with the Iraqi declaration, since we made our position clear in that regard in a letter that was circulated as a Council document. We are hopeful that the Council will rectify the error that was made, particularly since a large number of its members stated in our recent consultations their desire to receive a full copy of the Iraqi declaration in order to form their opinion and views independently and responsibly. This is also important in order to maintain the unity of the Council's work with respect to significant issues, as has been affirmed by many Council members.

It is well known that we have achieved tangible progress in the area of the transparency of the Council's work. The Council has held an unprecedentedly large number of open meetings, and non-member States have participated in the Council's work more than ever before. They had the opportunity to express their views with regard to the political issues being discussed and to express their vision for finding solutions for these issues. The Council has also held a number of wrap-up meetings in which members and non-members reviewed its work.

The Council has achieved tangible improvements in the past period. Having regular briefings on the

situation in the Middle East was one of the achievements that deserve mention here. The Council, throughout its working years, did not have such an opportunity to discuss the situation in an explosive region that constitutes a real threat to international peace and security. At the same time, we should all be aware of the fact that the Council has not followed up on the implementation of a number of its resolutions which negatively impacts its work and prevents the achievement of real progress to reach a settlement in this and other regions that are conflict-ridden.

Dealing with Council resolutions and the importance of implementing them should be based on equality and a single standard. Syria considers international legality, as represented by the United Nations and all its bodies, including the Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, as one of the main pillars on which it relies in seeking a comprehensive and just peace, particularly in the Middle East, and generally in other conflict-ridden areas of the world.

In this context, Syria views any attempt to keep the Council from dealing closely with the issues relating to the Middle East, under different pretexts, a matter that is not just improper, but actually contradicts the concept of collective security, the Charter and the willingness of the international community to cooperate to find solutions for the challenges faced by our world.

We believe strongly that any attempt to equate the Palestinian people, who are subject to a hateful and continuous Israeli occupation with the terrorist policies of the Israeli Government that contradict a just and comprehensive peace is a clear and flagrant contradiction of the Charter. This is an unacceptable violation of the United Nations role, and of that of the Security Council.

The Israeli occupation of our land, which constitutes the highest form of terrorism, is a question that our Council should confront when there is a discussion of the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is a matter that should be terminated as a matter of priority in the Council's work in order to reach a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East, instead of talking about alleged terrorism undertaken by the Palestinian people, who are the real victims of Israeli terrorism.

The Security Council has made great efforts to deal with African issues in order to reach a settlement for conflict-ridden areas. The establishment of the Working Group on the prevention and settlement of conflicts in Africa, which was headed by Mauritius very seriously and efficiently, helped to consolidate the role of the Council and contributed to dealing with African issues. The Council has followed up on the developments that have occurred in Angola, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and has given specific importance to Somalia during the period under consideration. We still have a lot to do in this area. We would like to state here that the Security Council's missions to conflict-ridden areas have contributed largely to ending these conflicts and to reaching a settlement, because it has allowed members to get acquainted with the real situation there.

The Council has also discussed many substantive issues in the areas of peacekeeping, women, security, peace, children and civilians in times of war, as well as the issue of terrorism. The Council has achieved many successes in dealing with many of these issues and has achieved progress that cannot be overlooked.

Syria will continue to work actively to consolidate transparency in the Council's work and looks forward to more serious work to improve the machinery of the Council and to make it more credible and responsive to what the Charter states.

Mr. Tafrov (Bulgaria): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to join the previous speakers in extending to you and to the entire team of the delegation of Colombia our warmest congratulations on your able guidance of the work of the Security Council during the month of December. You have coped with the challenging tasks before the Council in a remarkable manner, in spite of the fact that the Council's programme during the month was a truly busy one.

This wrap-up session of the Council has, in a way, a unique and symbolic character, since it is being held at the end of the year, when the time is most appropriate to look retrospectively at what has been achieved and what has not during the past year. In addition, it is time to listen to the views of those non-permanent members that are leaving the Council. These views are truly valuable, since they give a succinct review of a two-year experience, on which the Council could build in its future activities. Since the previous speakers have already covered most of the areas

relevant for this discussion, I would like to focus briefly on several issues that we deem important.

With regard to the programme of work, we share the view that during the past year the Council has dealt on a continuous basis with a series of complex political and security situations, achieving positive results on a number of cases. The most convincing of these are the progress achieved in East Timor, the excellent work on Afghanistan, the improvement of the situation in Sierra Leone, and the progress in the Balkans in the context of the successful completion of the United Nations missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Prevlaka.

The enormous amount of work done by the Counter-Terrorism Committee and the Committee established under resolution 1267 (1999) aimed at insuring the necessary conditions for full implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) also definitely deserves a positive assessment. The biggest portion of the Council's work was devoted to conflicts on the African continent, although with mixed results.

Significant progress was achieved in the resolution of the conflict in the Great Lakes region, which is probably the most complex of all conflicts in Africa. This is a conflict where the Security Council can make a difference. The Council remained, throughout the year, in constant contact with the parties. The mission to the region in May, and the high-level meeting with the parties in September in New York, were positive contributions to the coordinated efforts of the international community to bring peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region as a whole. In 2003, we have to continue to be proactive on this issue in order to consolidate the peace process.

While the situation in Sierra Leone in 2002 has considerably improved, thanks to the action of the Council, the United Nations Assistance Mission in Sierra Leone and the commendable efforts of the United Kingdom, the Council will have to follow closely the unstable situation in neighbouring Liberia. Considerable strides were made in the peace process in Angola. The United Nations peacekeeping efforts with regard to Ethiopia/Eritrea are encouraging too. We have to continue to work hard on all these issues next year.

Despite the achievements of the "facilitation and the regional" initiative, the situation in Burundi still demands close monitoring by the Council. We also have to closely follow the developments in Côte d'Ivoire.

The commencement of the second phase of the Somalia reconciliation process is a significant step forward. The Council should continue to attach priority attention to the situation in this country with a view to finding the appropriate means to reverse the process of sliding into turmoil in that part of Africa.

On the activities of the sanctions committees, we listened carefully to the briefings of the outgoing chairmen only yesterday. The views expressed, the lessons learned and the recommendations on possible improvement of the methods of work should definitely be taken into consideration in the Council's future activities. Important contributions in this direction could be made in the working group on sanctions, which has resumed its work but still has not achieved real progress on the recommendations made.

With regard to its working methods, the Council should definitely continue to build on the positive results already achieved, namely in the area of more openness and transparency, as well as in its interaction with the media. Strengthened cooperation with the other United Nations organs and bodies on the basis of a comparative advantage and adherence to the respective mandates should also be commended. In this regard we consider that the positive experience of the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa and its interaction with the Economic and Social Council could be explored further.

Finally, on the issue of conflict management, we support more focused attention on the Council's future activities on the connections between conflict prevention and conflict resolution and the work to promote sustainable development. In this context devising appropriate exit strategies is of critical importance for the successful post-conflict reconstruction and development.

In conclusion, I would like to use the words of Mrs. d'Achon of France delivered last year at the 4445th meeting, on the same occasion, when Bulgaria was sitting at the side bench and preparing for membership in the Council:

> "This is a time for saying *au revoir* — though certainly not *adieu* — to the five non-permanent members that are leaving the Council.

of course, we will continue to work with them outside the Security Council and use to the maximum their experience and expertise."

Mr. Aguilar Zinser (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me first of all to express our gratitude to the delegation of Colombia for having included in the Security Council's programme of work for December this public meeting to have a wrap-up of this body's work during 2002 as well as to identify the challenges and pending tasks of the Council for 2003. This meeting has also been an ideal occasion to listen to the assessment of the non-permanent Council members who are leaving this body on the last day of December.

The Council is made up of 15 members who represent their countries and regions. In carrying out the Council's tasks, they try to reconcile their national interests with the collective interest and the joint responsibility of enabling this body to defend international peace and security above particular or specific national interests. This tension between national interests and collective responsibility — which we all have in the Council — has been a recurring theme in the course of this year. We have to acknowledge the valuable contributions made from their national perspectives by the five countries leaving the Council at the end of this month.

In this respect, I would like to state the gratitude of my delegation for the sustained and persevering work of the delegation of Colombia in several items and for the leadership that has shown in some of them and that has taken on a particular importance. We would like to thank Colombia for the work in the area of small arms and light weapons, which is a legacy that cannot be abandoned by this Council.

In the year 2002, the Security Council stepped up its meetings and important responsibilities and made its working programme broader and more inclusive. This is something that comes up year after year. The Council assumes these responsibilities with the experience and desire to participate actively in the tasks of peace and the promotion of international security. At the same the Council this year has perhaps become much more visible than it has ever been in the past. The attention of the world's mass media is sharper and more sustained with regard to the Council's daily work on the specific matter of Iraq.

This has given the Council an identity in international public opinion which perhaps it did not have before. But it has also placed the Council under the scrutiny of the Members of the United Nations, who today more than ever would like to see the Council respond with a greater sense of responsibility and with transparency to the tasks entrusted to it. The members of the United Nations also hope that there will be closer communications between the Security Council, other United Nations bodies and the different States that are not members of the Council but whose concurrence is essential in carrying out our tasks.

In this respect, Mexico is firmly in support of greater transparency in the Security Council's working methods, particularly with regard to the deliberations on substantive items of the programme of work. We have not achieved the transparency in our working methods that the United Nations community would like. But we have made important progress this year in having a large number of information meetings on different items, at which the Secretariat shares its points of view with the Council, become public. We would also like the substantive deliberations to become more public to the extent that that is possible and desirable. With respect to working methods, the Council has made progress in looking for formulas that would make it possible to streamline its decision-making process, to make it more democratic, and — why not say it — more subject to controls and responsibility.

In this respect we must note the work done by the delegation of Singapore this year, and throughout its two years on the Security Council. This was a special contribution that leaves an important legacy: the delegations that must continue the tasks of the Council should maintain this intensive quest for more effective working methods, to broaden the scope of our work, ensuring that it more properly reflects the realities, with better information systems for the Council, while fostering a more flexible exchange of ideas and points of view. Part of the ongoing concern of Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani and his entire delegation during the past year has been to ensure that the Security Council would be able to responsibly comply with its tasks.

To that end, they sought initiatives and working methods that were different. There was also a central concern that the Security Council have closer links with the General Assembly through its reports and through its ties with other United Nations bodies. We have to continue working along these lines. We have to

go further in many of the initiatives which were outlined and are on the table, and on which Ambassador Mahbubani and his team provided leadership that left a very important mark on the Security Council.

This year the Security Council took decisions on major conflict situations, maintaining the principle of unity and consensus. This is perhaps one of the most important achievements that we have to celebrate here. There were very few occasions on which the Council's votes were divided. The unity and consensus achieved by the Council reflect the maturity with which States shoulder their responsibilities, as well as the introduction of working methods and formulas which make it possible to achieve such consensus.

In this respect, Mexico has supported and advocated the idea that the Middle East, including the Palestinian situation, would be considered periodically by all the members of the Security Council, both in public briefings and in consultations. The presence of the situation in the Middle East as an ongoing item on our agenda undoubtedly represents important progress in the search for agreement and consensus in that region, which is afflicted by a conflict which sometimes seems to be unresolvable. We hope the Security Council, by keeping its finger on the pulse of the Middle East and by holding monthly consultations, will provide elements to increase peace and stability in the area. Through these regular consultations, perhaps we can make a contribution to the peace process which is being promoted by the Quartet in the search for a just and lasting solution which could be achieved through the recognition of two States living side by side within secure borders and in conditions of peace and understanding.

We are also pleased with the fact that in the course of the year the Security Council has given timely follow-up to the situations of other countries or regions in conflict, such as the Great Lakes region, with an emphasis on the political process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as the region of West Africa.

The Security Council has had an important role in the progress made in the peace process in Sierra Leone as well as on considering the internal conflict in Liberia and the emergence of new areas of tension in Madagascar and in Côte d'Ivoire.

We would like to emphasize the importance of mediation efforts, whether related to specific Member countries or to regional or subregional organizations in Africa, in finding solutions to crisis situations in the region. Here, we would like to mention the work done by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa. We believe that the leadership shown by Ambassador Koonjul of Mauritius and his entire delegation fully justifies the establishment of the Working Group and makes it necessary that it continue its work in order to establish the links between the Security Council, regional organizations and the countries of the region, with a view to anticipating events and to promote initiatives and attitudes which would strengthen the capacity of African organizations and countries to reach agreements and to achieve peace and stability in the region.

As it considered the various situations of countries in conflict, in 2002, the Security Council highlighted the need for greater cooperation and coordination among the various actors in order to deal with the dramatic repercussions of these conflicts, and, in particular, in order to tackle the humanitarian situation of the flow of refugees and internally displaced persons and especially the situation of women and of child soldiers.

In this context, Mexico would echo the statements of those delegations who have said here that we need greater coordination and cooperation between United Nations agencies and regional and subregional organizations. In the same vein, we should make special mention of the fact that the international community must continue to support programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants in post-conflict situations, in order to prevent the re-emergence of tension and of factors which would endanger progress in the peace processes.

In this respect my delegation would like to acknowledge the tireless efforts carried out by the delegation of Norway and by Ambassador Kolby in dealing with specific situations and in stressing the use of the Security Council's capacities in areas related to peace in Africa, in particular with respect to Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea. Ambassador Kolby's departure will leave a leadership gap in this area which the other members of the Security Council will have to make an effort to fill.

With respect to promoting human rights and humanitarian causes, we must make special mention of the delegation of Ireland which made an ongoing contribution to the Security Council's work in this area. Here, we should also stress the Irish delegation's important work in the Angola sanctions Committee, which enabled the Committee successfully to conclude its work recently.

One of the success stories of the United Nations and of the Security Council in 2002 has been the situation in Timor-Leste. Undeniably, the United Nations has made a beneficial contribution to the establishment of a new independent State and to the formation of a Government and of administrative, security and defence structures.

We regret the recent events that have taken place in Timor-Leste, but we believe that the institutional basis set up by the United Nations provides a guarantee that those clashes and any subsequent ones can be dealt with peacefully and with respect for the rule of law. We must, however, keep the Council constantly involved in that region.

Lastly, I would like to comment on the sanctions regimes established by the Security Council. I, in my capacity as Chairman of the sanctions Committee for Sierra Leone, and my delegation visited the Mano River Union region last June, when we had the opportunity to speak with regional players in that country and in Guinea and Liberia. As a result, we gained a much greater understanding of the scope and the functioning of the sanctions regimes, as well as the conditions in which the sanctions are implemented and the violations that they are subject to.

I would like to stress the importance of the Chairmen of sanctions Committees becoming directly involved in the work by visiting the region and becoming familiar with the specific circumstances there. As Ambassador Mahbubani said, there is sometimes a great deal of confusion and ambivalence in the public's perception of the work of those Committees and of the meaning of sanctions. We must bear that in mind and constantly review them in order to keep those regimes active.

In this context, we support the statements made by various members of the Council that the Secretariat be provided with adequate human and budgetary resources to enable it to support the work of the sanctions Committees and monitor the sanctions regimes, to draw upon lessons learned and to develop an institutional memory — an archive based on the research of expert groups and the work carried out by various committees. In strengthening the institutional tasks of the committees and setting up mechanisms to ensure common understanding of responsibilities, my delegation promoted the tripartite meetings between the sanctions Committees related primarily to diamonds.

One pending item for Security Council consideration in 2003 is the validity and relevance of the criteria and objectives of the sanctions regimes imposed on Liberia and Sierra Leone in the light of the political progress made in those countries.

The recent discussion that the Council held following the lifting of sanctions on UNITA in Angola should provide a model for other countries in West Africa. We must prevent sanctions regimes from becoming permanent or dysfunctional, and we must therefore revise, taking timely and proper measures in that respect.

In conclusion, I would like to express the support of Mexico for the practice of holding wrap-up meetings, which I hope will be continued in 2003. It is also desirable for us to hold annual wrap-up meetings such as this one in order to strengthen transparency, which directly benefits the members of the Security Council and strengthens our Organization and our ties with the other States Members of the United Nations.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the representative of Mexico for his kind words addressed to me.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): I would like to focus — as you, Sir, have asked us to — on the institutional aspects of our work over the past 12 months, to pay particular attention to what the outgoing members of the Council have said this morning and to make some additional comments. By way of preamble, may I also say how much we appreciated the freshness and vigour which the outgoing members of the Council brought to the discussions of the Council. They have made us think about how we are doing our work in a way which we do not often do — and we are continuing that this morning under your presidency, Sir.

The agenda is becoming overloaded and I very much share the feeling of the Irish delegation that there

needs to be a way of continually filtering what we do. I think that we have had some useful innovations this year. More of the management of the agenda is going to coordinators and there have been fewer obligatory meetings with the Council presidency at the beginning of the month to go over the agenda, which can be done before we reach the beginning of the month. I also found the daily e-mails of the Colombian delegation, sent by Andrés Franco, to be extraordinarily helpful in pushing us towards what needed to be done each day and giving us notice of the changes in the mind of the presidency about how we needed to deal with the agenda. All of that was innovation in the right direction.

I would also like to pay tribute to our experts. There is an increasing tendency to deal with texts outside informal consultations and for ambassadors not to spend their time and competence on them; our experts seem to do it better. The fact that that tendency is increasing is also very welcome.

This morning several members — particularly the outgoing members — have referred to unity in the Council. I think that, when we can get it right, this is a very real evolution of compelling impact. But we must not forget that unity of result depends in the end on what happens in capitals and the perceptions there. We need to go on ensuring that our ministers understand the need for collective action through the Council as much as we appreciate it among ourselves, because we cannot produce unity if we do not get instructions to do so.

That element has to be remembered. I think that resolution 1441 (2002) was a striking example of that, not least because, if I may say so, the two countries at either end of the spectrum of debate on that issue — the United States and Syria — both came to conclude that unity in the Council was what they were looking for. If we learn the lessons of that and apply them — not only on that subject — in the future, then I think that we will increase the power, effectiveness and legitimacy of the Council.

We are not just an isolated Council. We have to deal with the Secretariat, people on the ground and Governments, as well as other organs of the intergovernmental system. I think we have made progress on the relationship between the Council and the Economic and Social Council this year. I particularly appreciate the fact that the Guinea-Bissau mission was a combined mission, reflecting also, if I may say so, the excellent work done by Ambassador Koonjul with the Ad Hoc Working Group on Africa — another innovation, which he steered very successfully this year and which needs to be taken forward.

How we organize that sort of thing has an effect on our follow-up. Ambassador Mahbubani said this morning that the cultures of action, innovation and reflection were very important to the Council, and that the Council was not good on all of them. I actually think that we have been quite good at innovation and reflection, as well as action. What we have not been good at is follow-up and implementation. That is where the Council is really being tested as we become more professional in our mandates and in our discussions. I think we need to talk a little more about that and, indeed, act on it. I may come back to that in one or two respects.

In your intervention, Mr. President, you referred to the Council's work in combating terrorism, because we lacked time for a more considered discussion of that is sure when you had the breakout meeting the other morning. I want to share and, indeed, reinforce, your view. The Counter-Terrorism Committee is doing quite a lot of bureaucratic work on counter-terrorism, which is important. I am not trying to downplay that; why should I try to do so? But the Council is in danger of taking its eye off the ball that really matters, which is stopping terrorists.

I am not sure that the Council is grappling with the phenomenon of terrorism in all its aspects as substantively as it should. I think that we should have a discussion of this in January, if the French presidency will allow it, because, if and when the next really big incident happens and the Council has not proved yet to be particularly active in stopping terrorism on the ground, people will start throwing stones at us.

Therefore, Mr. President, I fully agree with your focus on that particular issue. It has to be a concern of the Council beyond the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee.

Allow me to get myself into trouble over the question of the permanent five, which the Ambassador of Guinea in particular focused on. He did continue a bit of a myth about the amount that the permanent five do before we come into the Council, which we have done only on Iraq this year, and necessarily on Iraq, as I think most members of the Council have realized. But

I do not think that the split, if you like, between the permanent five and the elected 10 affects, or is related to, transparency.

I think that the Council has become more transparent, and that is not a permanent five issue. With respect to legitimacy — if one wants to underline the politics of this, and that is why the United Kingdom supports reform and enlargement — we must not forget that an element of the political legitimacy of the Council is also professionalism. That is something which it is obligatory for the permanent five to introduce and which we discussed in the break-out meeting the other morning.

Non-permanent members of the Council talk about this, but I am not sure that they do very much about it. That is why I think that we should pick up the suggestion made by Norway — on which Ambassador Kolby and I agree — that there should be more of a tendency to take lead nations for a particular subject, and the non-permanents should be in the lead on that.

In my observation of the Council's work over the past four years, and in our own experience in the United Kingdom, it is extremely difficult for delegations on the Council to cover every subject evenly, fully and professionally. There is too much going on, and therefore there ought to be a division of functions, so that the professionalism of spending more time on a particular subject comes through.

Therefore, rather than just talking about it and re-mouthing it every time we have a wrap-up session, we ought to do something about it. I wonder whether the non-permanents at the beginning of next year might like to get together among themselves and see whether they would like to take that forward, because I think that it would help.

Ireland made a suggestion that we should have more meetings away from Headquarters, of the kind that was held the other day. I remember one or two comments at the end of that meeting about the usefulness of what we had just been doing and the role of informal consultations. We behave in informal consultations rather as we behave in here. In fact, I rarely see any difference between the style of our presentations between the two meetings, and the real purpose of informal consultations has drained away. We think that we are doing something, but actually we are not doing as much as we often do in open meetings.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think that is a theme that came out of your meeting, which you have commented on in your excellent paper — written in brilliant English, if I may say so — which we should take forward. There are themes here that you have written down for us which should not just go on the shelf. I would like to continue these discussions, perhaps, with a lunch early in the new year, so that the old members exiting can come and join us and share their experiences again. But I think that we need to talk a bit about how we use informals and whether we need to get really informal by getting away from Headquarters now and again.

Finally, Ambassador Mahbubani of Singapore, says, paradoxically, that we have not done much by way of innovation, when he, perhaps, has been the most innovative of all 15 of us over the past few years. But let us not look for institutional innovation; that is too difficult in this Organization. Let us look for practical innovation, which he has been so good at, and then we might actually be getting somewhere — get away from the institutional habits and get into practical innovation of what needs to be done, because there is a situation on the ground that needs it. There, I think, our growing habit of outside discussion would actually be exceedingly useful.

I have used up my 10 minutes, but I think that there is a lot there to follow up, and let us see if we can do it in the new year.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the Ambassador of the United Kingdom for his kind words, especially those addressed to the outgoing members.

Ms. d'Achon (France) (*spoke in French*): I will probably not use my full 10 minutes, because, within the framework of the progress that we are making with respect to enhancing the methods of work of the Security Council, later on we will be having a lunch with the Council coordinators at which we will have an exchange of views on the programme of work for January.

I would, however, like to thank you, Mr. President, for having convened this meeting. I would like to associate myself with the tributes that have been paid to your presidency, and we will, of course, take into account any ideas you can give us for next month.

We believe that this meeting has been particularly useful, although it is, of course, a sad occasion to see

our Security Council colleagues leave — colleagues with whom we have forged bonds of friendship and of — I hope — productive work in many areas. Each delegation, with its areas of specialization and its particular sensitivities, has brought to the Council an interesting and productive vision, and, as our colleague from the Russian Federation has stated, each one made a major contribution.

Many very important ideas have been expressed today by our departing colleagues. As Ambassador Greenstock said, we must make sure that they do not remain a dead letter but ensure that they are taken into account and, going beyond a conceptual framework, we must try to translate them into reality next year.

I will not go back to many of the areas that were alluded to by several delegations, but I would like to recall, in the context of the work that we have done in 2002, the great attention that the Security Council has focused on the question of Africa. Each month these questions make up almost two thirds of our work. True, as many delegation have stressed, many successes have been recorded — Angola, Sierra Leone, Ethiopia/ Eritrea, and the African Great Lakes region, to which the French Ambassador led a third mission.

It is true that these questions will remain on our agenda in 2003. We are concerned in particular by the situation in West Africa at this time. Indeed, the questions of Liberia, the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau, as well as Cote d'Ivoire — topics we will begin to deal with this afternoon — will continue to be a great concern to us.

As has been noted by many delegations, we have made quite a bit of progress in the fight against terrorism and on the questions of Afghanistan and Timor-Leste, but even there the Council must remain extremely vigilant. We fully agree with the proposal made by Ambassador Greenstock that we should examine in January what we have done in terms of fighting terrorism.

As to the challenges that we will be facing next year — you had asked us to think about this issue, Mr. President — one does not need to be a visionary to see that, at the beginning of the year, we will continue to be seized of all the questions of which we have spoken.

Mr. President, you asked us to think about the challenges of next year. One does not need to be a seer to know that all the files we have mentioned will continue to keep us occupied from the start of next year.

I would like to pick up on what the Ambassador of Singapore said about continuing to give some thought to a permanent sanctions mechanism. This would allow us to better share information, as he emphasized, and it seems important to us that the Council should continue to think about the sanctions sector.

Finally, I wish to note that there has been greater transparency in the Council's proceedings this past year. We have made a great deal of progress, which was partially recognized by the members of the General Assembly when the annual report was presented, and we have to continue the good work that we initiated in this area.

As other delegations have said, it is true that the Council's workload is such that we are practically at the saturation point in our monthly programmes of work. As the Norwegian Ambassador said, we must continue to think about this so that we can progress in the rationalization of the work that we do, including trying to find better working methods. We have to be more imaginative; we cannot remain content to continue applying the same methods as our workload continues to grow.

I do not know if it is through the Working Group on Documentation and Procedures that we will be able to do this, but it might be accomplished on a daily basis, through practical thinking, and maybe, as some delegations have said, by asking some countries to take the lead in discussions on specific topics — the matter of "lead nations" — and maybe also by ad hoc working groups of the Security Council.

The President (*spoke in Spanish*): Before concluding this meeting, I would like to inform Council members that the special document which was spoken of here on 11 December will be distributed as an official document, especially for the benefit of the non-members.

The Security Council has thus concluded the meeting. Simply to give you an idea of the timing, I must tell you that, on average, we did comply with the maximum 10-minute period for each statement. We would have liked it to have been shorter.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.